DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 277 CS 009 182

AUTHOR Battle, Mary Vroman
TITLE Dialogical Activities To Improve Communication of First-Semester University Freshmen through Teaching Reading Literature and Writing Compositions Interrelatedly.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 262p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, Memphis State University.
AVAILABLE FROM University Microfilms International, 300 N. Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (Order No. 86-19455).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Activities; Cloze Procedure; *College English; College Freshmen; Communication Skills; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Integrated Activities; Miscue Analysis; Reading Skills; *Reading Writing Relationship; Student Attitudes; Teaching Methods; Writing Evaluation; *Writing Exercises; Writing Instruction; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Dialogic Communication; *Dialogue Journals; Memphis State University TN; Writing about Literature; Writing Models; Writing Strategies

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effectiveness of a set of instructional activities designed to improve communication of university freshmen in standard-level, first-semester English through teaching interrelatedly the reading of prose literature and the writing of expository essays. Subjects, 24 typical first-semester freshmen, participated in the course, with activities including: (1) focusing on a definition of dialogue and three implied questions asked in all reading and writing; (2) creating microcosmic questions and answers; (3) sentence-outlining sub-questions and answers; (4) dialogical "sentence-debining" and sentence-combining; and (5) keeping journals. Besides assignments in reading and writing, transfer of learning was sought by practicing dialogical communication, arranging opportunities for discovering relationships between reading and writing, providing illustrative exercises, and suggesting ways to transfer learning beyond English class. The semester-long demonstration was monitored by six instruments: cloze reading samples, the Goodman miscue analysis, Buxton-scored writing samples, student interviews and instructor journal, and a questionnaire on instructional activities and the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS). Results indicated that the set of instructional activities was helpful in improving verbal and written communication. (Nineteen tables of data are included, and examples of dialogical microcosmic sentences, class schedule, student questionnaire, cloze reading samples, rating committee score sheet, writing sample questions, and 12 pages of references are appended.) (MM)

ED296277

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Battle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DIALOGICAL ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATION OF FIRST-SEMESTER UNIVERSITY FRESHMEN THROUGH TEACHING READING LITERATURE AND WRITING COMPOSITIONS INTERRELATEDLY

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

MARY VROMAN BATTLE

MAY, 1986

CS009182

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Mary Vroman Battle, entitled "Dialogical Activities to Improve Communication of First-Semester University Freshmen Through Teaching Reading Literature and Writing Compositions Interrelatedly." I recommend that it be accepted for twelve hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Foundations of Education (Research Methodology and Statistics).

Ernest A. Rakow
Ernest A. Rakow, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Robert A. Kaiser
Robert A. Kaiser

Michael Osborn
Michael Osborn

Steven M. Ross
Steven M. Ross

Robert F. Todd
Robert F. Todd

Accepted for the Graduate
Council:

Dorothy Arata
Dorothy Arata, Dean
Graduate School

Mary Vroman Battle

© 1986 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

"In the beginning was the WORD . . . ." (Bible)

"His WORD was his bond." (Tradition)

"The primary WORD can only be spoken with the whole being." (Buber)

"My father loved you;
he said he did,/
And with his deed
did crown his WORD." (Shakespeare)

"I steal WORDs from other writers."
(Student)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES xii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xiv

ABSTRACT xv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION: GENERAL PURPOSE, PARTICULAR APPROACH, AND SPECIFIC PURPOSE 1

Overview of the Study 1

General Purpose of the Study: Instructional Activities for Improving Both Reading and Writing 4

Definition of Terms Connected with the Problem 4

Description of the Problem: Inadequacies in the Students' Reading and Writing and in the Course 8

Inadequacies of Goals 8

Inadequacies of Psychological Approaches 10

Inadequacies of Methods for Reading and Writing 11

Inadequacies of Skills and Arts 13

Explanations for Inadequacies in the Course and in the Instructional Activities 15

Initiating Inadequate Goals 16

Misjudging Students' Psycholinguistic Capabilities . . . 18

Emphasizing Products While Neglecting Methods 23

Unsoundly Assuming That Learning Transfers Readily . . . 27

Statement of the General Purpose of the Study 31

Particular Approach to the General Purpose: Relationship Between Reading and Writing in the Course Setting 32

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Specific Purpose of the Study: Instructional Activities for Improving Both Reading and Writing by Teaching Them Interrelatedly	38
	Statement of the Specific Purpose	38
	Search of the Literature	39
	Method for Achieving the Specific Purpose	42
	Summary	43
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE: FOUNDATIONS OF CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	46
	Introduction	46
	Review of the Purposes of Communication in General, of Communication Through Written Discourse, and of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse	47
	Purpose of Communication in General: Dialogue	48
	Purpose of Communication Through Written Discourse: Recorded Dialogue	49
	Purpose of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse: Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialogue	51
	Criterion	53
	Review of the Characteristics of Communicators in General, of Communicators Using Written Discourse, and of Freshman Communicators Using Written Discourse	53
	Characteristic of Communicators in General: Developed Authenticity in Dialoguing.	54
	Characteristic of Communicators Using Written Discourse: Developed Authenticity in Recorded Dialoguing	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

Characteristic of Freshman Communicators Using Written Discourse: Developed Authenticity in Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialoguing 60

Criterion 65

Review of the Methods of Communicating in General, of Communicating Through Written Discourse, and of a Freshman's Communicating Through Written Discourse 65

Method of Communicating in General: Process of Interacting Through Dialogue 66

Method of Communicating Through Written Discourse: Process of Interacting Through Recorded Dialogue 67

Method of a Freshman's Communicating Through Written Discourse: Process of Interacting Through Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialogue 70

Criterion 75

Review of the Results of Communication in General, of Communication Through Written Discourse, and of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse 75

Results of Communication in General: Transferable Abilities in Dialoguing 77

Results of Communication Through Written Discourse: Transferable Abilities in Recorded Dialoguing 79

Results of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse: Transferable Abilities in Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialoguing 84

Criterion 93

Summary 93

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

III. DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO MEET CRITERIA FOUND IN THE LITERATURE 95

Activity for Emphasizing the Dialogical Nature of Communication: Centering the Course on a Definition and Three Implied Questions 97

First Sub-Activity for Dialogical Reading: Present Participants' Asking an Opening Question 100

Second Sub-Activity for Dialogical Reading: Hearing the Voice of the Unseen Author 101

Third Sub-Activity for Dialogical Reading: Marking a Series of Sub-Questions and Sub-Answers 102

First Sub-Activity for Dialogical Writing: Discovering an Answer-Insight Through Discussion 103

Second Sub-Activity for Dialogical Writing: Addressing Unseen Readers 105

Third Sub-Activity for Dialogical Writing: Planning a Series of Sub-Answers and Sub-Questions. 106

Activities for Developmentally Sequencing Learning Opportunities for Freshman Communicators Using Written Discourse 108

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Intellectual and Ethical Stages of Life: Instructor Leadership to Student Self-Direction. 109

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Written Discourse: Using Appropriate Reading As a Precursor for Writing 110

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth As Active Participants in Dialogical Writing: Informal to Simple-Academic Voices, Purposes, and Insights 111

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Awareness of Unseen Participants in the Dialogue: Peers to Negative Adults 112

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Such Means of Dialogue As Types of Series of Answers and Questions: Exposition by Narrative to Simple Argument 113

General Plan for a Semester. 115

Activities for Practicing the Seven Steps in the Processes of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse 116

Activity for Focused Dialoguing: Using a Dialogical Microcosmic Question or Answer 117

Activity for Broad Dialoguing: Using Dialogical Sentence-Outlining of Sub-Questions and Sub-Answers. . . . 119

Activity for Close Dialoguing: Dialogical Sentence-Debining and Sentence-Combining 120

Activity for Intensive Dialoguing: Dialogical Observation of Exactly What Is There 121

Activity for Evaluative Dialoguing: Dialogical Reviews by Helpful Others 122

Activity for Public Dialoguing: Sharing and Publication 123

Activity for Wide and Free Dialoguing: Reading and Writing Journals 124

Plan for a Two-Week Lesson 124

Activities for Interrelating Reading and Writing and Thus Laying Foundations for Transfer Between Them and to Other Disciplines 126

Demonstrating the Strength of Dialogical Communication in General 127

Providing Freshmen Opportunities to Discover the Relationships Between Reading and Writing 128

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

Providing an Exercise for Experiencing the Strength That Comes from Interrelating Reading and Writing 129

Suggesting Ways to Transfer Dialogical Communication Through Reading and Writing to Other Disciplines 129

Summary. 130

IV. EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES IN AN OBSERVED DEMONSTRATION: DESCRIPTION, OBSERVATIONAL METHODS, AND RESULTS 132

Pilot Study 133

Description of the Setting, Students, and Instructional Program for the Pilot Study 133

Methods of Observing the Instructional Activities in the Pilot Study: Instruments and Data Analysis 136

The Questionnaire on Instructional Activities and the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS) . . . 137

The Student Interviews and the Instructor's Journal. . . 139

Cloze Reading Samples Supplemented by the Goodman Miscue Analysis 140

Buxton-Scored Writing Samples 142

Evaluation of the Instructional Activities and of the Instruments in the Pilot Study 145

Dialogical Communication Along with Course Goals 145

Developmental Sequencing Along with Course Demands . . . 148

Processes of Communicating Through Reading and Writing Along with Course Instruction 151

Transferability Along with Skills and Arts Shown in the Course's Products of Reading and Writing 159

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

Major Instruments 166

Statement of New Directions for the Demonstration 167

Demonstration 169

Description of the Setting, Students, and Instructional Program for the Demonstration 169

Methods of Observing the Instructional Activities in the Demonstration: Instruments and Data Analysis 171

The Questionnaire on Instructional Activities and the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS) 172

The Student Interviews and the Instructor's Journal 172

The Cloze Reading Samples Supplemented by the Goodman Miscue Analysis 172

Buxton-Scored Writing Samples 173

Evaluation of the Instructional Activities and of the Instruments in the Demonstration 174

Dialogical Communication Along with Course Goals 174

Developmental Sequencing Along with Course Demands . . . 176

Processes of Communicating Through Reading and Writing Along with Course Instruction 180

Transferability Along with Skills and Arts Shown in the Course's Products of Reading and Writing 188

Major Instruments 196

Summary of the Description, Observational Methods, and Evaluation of the Demonstration 199

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS 202

Summary of Findings 202

Discussion of Findings 209

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Implications of Findings for Theory, Practice, and Future Research	214
BIBLIOGRAPHY		220
APPENDICES		232
A.	Dialogical Microcosmic Sentences	233
B.	Tentative Schedule of Readings and Writings	235
C.	Questionnaire on This Semester's Activities to Learn Reading Literature and Writing Compositions	237
D.	Cloze Reading Samples: Instructions and Three Selections	239
E.	Score Sheet to Be Used by Rating Committee	242
F.	Writing Samples	243

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Pilot Study: Demographics of the Freshmen Who Completed the Course	135
2	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of the Activity for Centering the Course on Dialogue and of the Measures of the Goals of the Course	146
3	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Activities for Developmental Sequencing, of the Course Demands, and of all Aspects of the Course That Were Not Classified as Course Demands on the SIRS	149
4	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing	152
5	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing by Means of Multivariate Analysis of Variance	154
6	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Reading and the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Writing by Two One-Way Analyses of Variance	156
7	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Instruction in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS	158
8	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Achievements in Reading According to the Cloze Reading Samples and in Writing According to the Buxton-Scored Writing Samples	162
9	Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Their Achievements in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS	166

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
10	Demonstration: Demographics of the Freshmen Who Completed the Course	170
11	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of the Activity for Centering the Course on Dialogue and of the Measures of the Goals of the Course	176
12	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Activities for Developmental Sequencing, of the Course Demands, and of All Aspects of the Course That Were Not Classified as Course Demands on the SIRS	178
13	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing	181
14	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing by Means of Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Univariate Follow-up	183
15	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Reading and the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Writing by Two One-Way Analyses of Variance	185
16	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Instruction in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS	187
17	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Achievements in Reading According to the Cloze Reading Samples and in Writing According to the Buxton-Scored Writing Samples	193
18	Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Their Achievements in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS	195
19	Comparison of Three Passages Used in the Cloze Reading Samples for the Pilot Study and the Demonstration.	198

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses gratitude for the invaluable contributions of Dr. Ernest A. Rakow, Major Professor. Dr. Rakow's high dedication to teaching, research, and statistics, observed during the past seven years, has inspired diligent work to make this dissertation a means of giving thanks.

Also acknowledged is the guidance by Dr. Robert A. Kaiser, Dr. Michael M. Osborn, Dr. Steven M. Ross, and Dr. Robert F. Todd, members of the doctoral committee, particularly for their assistance in forming the proposal for this study.

Appreciation is merited by persons throughout Memphis State University--professors who enlightened, administrators who gave support, colleagues in English, academic student advisors, those who scored the writing samples, personnel at the Computer Center, Mrs. Jeanne Tutor, librarians, and secretaries, each of whom contributed in an essential way to the completion of this undertaking. My students, our future leaders, have continuously supplied incentive.

Last goes deep appreciation to Mrs. Nellie Ruth Brown, to the supporters and dear friends who were always there, and, especially, to my family who opened time and supplied faith.

ABSTRACT

Battle, Mary Vroman, Ed.D. Memphis State University, May, 1986. Dialogical Activities to Improve Communication of First-Semester University Freshmen Through Teaching Reading Literature and Writing Compositions Interrelatedly. Major Professor: Ernest A. Rakow, Ph.D.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to develop thoroughly one coherent set of instructional activities to improve communication of university freshmen in standard-level, first-semester English through teaching interrelatedly the reading of prose literature and the writing of expository essays. Although some courses pressure students to produce correct, albeit mindless, writing, this set of activities was intended not only to meet students' immediate academic needs in both reading and writing but also to undergird future growth.

Procedures

Research in philosophy, psychology, linguistics, and learning theory each established one criterion for designing the activities. The criteria required emphasizing dialogue although including correctness, sequencing content developmentally though meeting exiting standards, covering seven recursive steps in the processes of both reading and writing along with describing products, and facilitating transfer of learning between reading and writing while improving skills and arts in both.

The first activity designed was centering the course on a definition of dialogue and three implied questions to be asked in all reading and writing. The course's contents were sequenced from less to more independent and academic, with reading precursing writing. To help students carry out the steps of reading and writing, the instructor demonstrated creating microcosmic questions and answers, sentence-outlining sub-questions and answers, dialogical sentence-debining and sentence-combining, seeing what is there on the page, using reviews by helpful others, sharing and responding, and keeping journals for enrichment. Besides assignments in reading and writing to improve skills and arts, transfer of learning was sought by practicing dialogical communication, arranging opportunities for discovering relationships between reading and writing, providing an illustrative exercise, and suggesting ways to transfer learning beyond English class.

These activities were demonstrated with 24 fairly typical first-time freshmen, whose scores in ACT-English averaged 20.3. The semester-long demonstration was observed by six instruments. The data, analyzed by statistical and qualitative methods, facilitated evaluation of the activities along Stufflebeam's CIPP model.

Findings and Conclusions

The set of instructional activities was evaluated as "helpful," 2.00 on a scale of 1 for "very helpful" through 5 for "a hindrance." All students also passed the course. Activities for centering the course on dialogue and for sequencing content developmentally worked helpfully. Eleven of the fourteen activities for teaching the steps in reading and writing worked helpfully; the other three, identified

by multiple analysis of variance and one-way analyses of variance, will benefit from minor refinements. The activities for transfer were evaluated as helpful; students' skills and arts in both reading, as measured by cloze reading samples, and in writing, as measured by Buxton-scored writing samples, increased to practically and statistically significant degrees from 46.0 to 59.5, t (23) = -7.41, $p < .001$, and from 27.4 to 48.4, t (23) = -8.07, $p < .001$. The six instruments were valid, several refinements being suggested. Non-instructional factors in the course posed some measured problems.

Implications and Recommendations

Compared with achievements in other studies reported herein, these students' achievements in both reading and writing were greater. The helpfulness of the instructional activities suggests the value of stating a philosophy of communication, suiting nurture to natural development, using laboratory methods to teach steps of reading and writing, and interrelating reading and writing for synergistic effects. These activities may now be evaluated experimentally across teacher and student variables. However, instructional activities alone have not overcome heavy course demands or unsuitable class size nor, as the pilot study indicated, inadequate student preparation. Support for improving non-instructional factors of the course, such as adding laboratory time and credit, can come from interdisciplinary researchers and planners. Meantime these instructional activities, based on a long-term, practical-liberal model, are available to contribute to improving the communication the world badly needs.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION: GENERAL PURPOSE, PARTICULAR APPROACH, AND SPECIFIC PURPOSE

Overview of the Study

In a world in which communication breaks down frequently and dangerously, human beings' abilities to communicate fully, clearly, and effectively have become more important than ever. When students graduate from universities, they need to communicate through the kind of reading that accesses much of what Matthew Arnold (1869/1952, p. 768) calls "the best that has been thought and known in the world." They also need to communicate through the kind of writing that reaches people of wide diversity, at vast distances, and across long periods of time. University students should learn these practical and liberating skills and arts of communication gradually during their four years of academic endeavors.

Some definite progress towards acquiring these abilities in communication can be made by university freshmen. By the end of their first semester, university freshmen need to read and write English at a level that is acceptable for meeting their immediate academic and personal goals and that is sound enough to serve as a foundation for future growth. Freshmen must read expository literature and must write essay examinations and simple expository papers. Also they must

lay foundations on which to base their learning of additional skills and arts during the succeeding three-and-a-half years.

The problem is that all too many freshmen who complete the activities of the standard first-semester course in English have not reached these acceptable levels. After completing a course with narrow, practical goals, students sometimes perceive future reading and writing as mere correctness rather than as communication of critical and creative thought and feeling. Since some first-semester courses pressure students, students may regard future writing with distaste. Despite having completed many assignments, students may not know how to proceed with new kinds of reading and writing. After a course dominated by writing, students may develop weak skills in reading and specialized skills in writing which do not transfer readily. In short, the largely immediately practical course often fails to enable students to learn the long-term liberating arts of communication that would serve as foundations for future learning.

Explanations for these inadequacies appear in the fact that some planners prefer short-term goals, overestimate the psycholinguistic capacities of freshmen, underestimate the time needed for satisfactory learning, and assume the automatic transfer of learning between reading and writing and to other courses. Some students use short-cuts. In these circumstances sometimes instructors use time-saving but less-effective instructional activities.

The general purpose of this study is to overcome some of those barriers to learning which an instructor of the course is in a position to overcome by means of developing instructional activities

to help university freshmen improve communication through both reading and writing English. An instructor can exceed incomplete goals, develop skills gradually, point out methods of reading and writing, and strengthen transfer of learning.

Since students need both reading and writing and since research established that both reading and writing should be taught directly, it became important to determine the course setting in which to teach them. Reading and writing can be taught directly in separate courses; either reading or else writing can be taught directly in one course with the questionable assumption that the other skill will be improved; or both reading and writing can be taught directly and interrelatedly in one course using three or more class hours and credit hours. The later, interrelational approach is now strongly supported by research. Also administrative constraints applied to course offerings make the one-course approach the feasible one for this study.

The specific purpose of this study is to fully develop one coherent set of instructional activities for teaching communication to first-semester university freshmen by learning activities in both reading and writing English presented interrelatedly within one standard beginning course to enable students to reach acceptable immediate and foundational levels.

The remainder of this chapter fully documents the inadequacies and the explanations for them, leading to the general purpose of the study--to teach both reading and writing. It provides the rationale for the particular approach to the general purpose--to teach both reading and writing interrelatedly. It clarifies the specific purpose

of the study--to teach both reading and writing interrelatedly in one course.

Each of the four subsequent chapters covers one stage in the full development of the set of instructional activities to accomplish the specific purpose.

General Purpose of the Study: Instructional Activities for Improving Both Reading and Writing

This section defines the terms of the problem, documents the inadequacies in students' written discourse and the associated inadequacies in the course, provides several explanations for these inadequacies, and states explicitly the general purpose of the study along with delimitations.

Definition of Terms Connected with the Problem

In order that the problem be clarified, several terms must be defined stipulatively. These terms help to delineate what the standard first-semester course of university English often includes, who the freshmen are, what the learning activities are, and what outcomes are expected.

The standard first-semester of English is a three credit-hour course required by almost all universities. It may be preceded by a pre-standard course for underprepared students which focuses on short works, and it is often followed by other courses in English. The standard course may be centered on communication through written discourse or on reading but is usually centered on writing. "Communication" means "making common or sharing of something between

two or among several persons or groups of people" (Communication, 1969, p. 203) through an interactive process, that is, getting "into significant touch with" another person or other persons (Howe, 1963, p. vii). While "written discourse" sometimes refers to reading or writing, in this study "written discourse" refers to both reading and writing of language in script. When the course is centered on writing, students usually write full-length 500-word compositions that employ varied patterns of exposition, such as describing, narrating, giving examples, defining, comparing and contrasting, classifying, analyzing for cause or effect, and analyzing the stages in a process. The course often introduces argumentative discourse briefly, touching on reasoning and persuading. It does not cover reading or writing of non-expository literature, such as poetry or novels, or of research-based discourse, such as research papers or term papers.

Freshmen in the standard first-semester course in English are those students judged adequately prepared by meeting certain minimum requirements, such as having 19 or above in ACT-English or having received a CUNY-rank (City University of New York Task Force on Writing, 1979) of 4 or better on a sample of their writing. They are not so well prepared as to be placed in an honors class for students meeting certain requirements, such as having an ACT-English of 26 or higher. They vary in preparation, race, age, sex, motives, and other characteristics.

Learning activities in this course are those actions taken by students in an effort to accomplish the goals of the course. If the course includes reading per se, students may read at least one full-length essay of each of the approximately eight patterns of

exposition and one argument at the "instructional level" (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) along with writing all or some of the compositions assigned in writing programs. In writing programs, students may read at least one short essay of the nine patterns at the "independent level" (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586); write eight to twelve essays using different patterns of exposition and at least one argument for a total of 4,000 words; correct all of these compositions; and rewrite some compositions. Students will write some of these essays in class, sometimes from an outline prepared in advance. In addition, they write a final examination-essay, sometimes on the full-length essays read. Students may also have one or more conferences with the instructor, edit papers of their peers, take notes on lectures, read the rhetoric text, do exercises such as those on sentence-combining, and perhaps attend a resource center to overcome special difficulties.

Levels of communication acceptable for completing the standard freshmen course in English vary from university to university, some universities giving scant attention to reading. Ideally, "reading at a level acceptable for meeting immediate and foundational needs" means that after instruction in the course, students have developed the skills and arts of comprehension of beginning university-level, full-length expository and simple argumentative essays, such as the first and second essays in each section of Trimmer and Hairston's The Riverside Reader (1981). Ideally, if students read these essays in what Bormuth (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) calls the upper "frustrational level" or lower "instructional level" at the beginning of the semester, they might be expected to move at least one-third

of the way into the "instructional level" and towards the "independent level" by the end of the semester. Reading comprehension is literal and intensive when the reader grasps the literal and expressive meaning of vocabulary and sentences. It is inferential and interpretive when the reader understands and recreates the central or underlying thought, the supporting facts, and the steps of the author's thinking. It is critical and creative when the reader evaluates and forms awareness of the author's insights in the author's voice, of the intended readers, and of the literary means of presentation, such as narration and classification.

Often, "writing at a level acceptable for meeting immediate and foundational needs" means that after instruction in the course, students have developed the skills and arts of writing with comprehensibility beginning university-level thoughts, such as those in the first and second student-written essays in each section of Memering and O'Hare's Writer's Work, 2nd ed. (1984), to beginning-level academic audiences, using basic expository patterns. Comprehensibility of writing is literal and intensive when the writer uses accurately and vividly worded, clear and forceful sentences, making perhaps no more than one serious error for a C and two errors for a D. It is inferential and interpretive when the writer puts forward a single central insight or thought, provides adequate supporting facts, and uses coherent order. It is critical and creative when the writer reveals sound and freshly voiced insights, correct and full views of the intended readers, and sensible and pleasing means of presentation, such as interesting examples or appropriate comparisons.

In this study, "immediately practical skills" are defined as being cognitive abilities in the literal, inferential, and critical areas. The "affective arts" are defined as being affective abilities in the intensive, interpretive, and creative areas.

Description of the Problem: Inadequacies in the Students' Reading and Writing and in the Course

Almost every student in every institution of higher education takes a first-semester course in English, and both the students' achievements and the courses' qualities vary along a continuum from excellent to unacceptable. Here will be described some of the problems that have existed, that is, some students' inadequacies in written discourse associated with some courses' inadequacies. These inadequacies are presented in the categories of Stufflebeam's (1970/1973) model for evaluation, namely, contexts, or goals; input, or psycholinguistic capabilities of students; processes, or learning activities performed; and outcomes, or skills and arts learned.

Inadequacies of Goals

What do many freshmen perceive as the goals of reading and writing after completing a course designed to clarify what goals that are more or less adequate? Many freshmen perceive the goal as mostly correctness of writing or, to use one student's terms, "plastic papers." Such papers may contain correctly spelled words in correctly phrased sentences in correctly organized paragraphs in correctly framed essays, but the papers are almost devoid of critical or creative thought and feeling.

Many freshmen who perceive the goal as correctness have taken courses with a narrow, immediately practical goal of reading, writing,

or both reading and writing. Very few courses are limited to the narrow goal of exposing "students to good literature" (White, 1983, p. 177) along with challenging students to think, and feel, and do some writing. A few more courses which are called "knowledge-centered" by Davis, Scriven, and Thomas (1981, p. 57) focus on literature, rhetoric, and logic, providing challenges to thinking and some opportunities for writing. More courses are limited to teaching "correct grammar and usage" (White, 1983, p. 178). Most typically, however, the courses in a writing program center on correctness of writing with little concern for reading per se at what Bormuth (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) calls the "instructional level." Within this kind of writing course, according to a national survey (Kinneavy, 1982), objectives vary; program directors generally stress writing mechanically correct prose although instructors of the course generally prefer to stress writing coherent prose. This course is often regarded by other stakeholders in the university as a service course with the goal of teaching students to write correctly the academic papers required during their remaining university years. When the course goal becomes merely the immediately practical one of mechanical correctness, the course can become what Wayne Booth (1981, p. 16) calls a "mindless service course."

Thus, too many freshmen perceive the goal of written discourse as a bland, practical correctness partly because they have taken a course which has a goal of "mindless service" (Booth, 1981, p. 16) and which makes it unlikely that they will look upon future written discourse as communication of critical and creative thought and feeling through both reading and writing.

Inadequacies of Psychological Approaches

With what attitude do freshmen tend to approach further reading and writing after completing a course designed with what psychological approach? Freshmen tend to react negatively to writing and to avoid it. Some students resent the physical discomfort of writing in class from outlines on desks with small arm tables designed for taking lecture notes. Some are "written out" by the end of the semester. Some choose instructors of multi-sections of future non-English courses so as to avoid any required writing and say that they "want to get English out of the way" as soon as possible. Far fewer students majored in English in 1984 than in 1970, a drop of 57% (Bennett, 1984).

Many freshmen with such attitudes have taken courses that proceed at a fast pace and that put more than ordinary pressure on them in various ways. Since courses require, in addition to other activities, eight to fourteen papers or approximately 4,000 words, not counting revisions, students have scarcely written one paper and possibly revised it before the next is due. Students who miss a class fall outside the fast flow of assignments. Students have heard that sometimes thirty per cent of those who begin the course fail; and more than one instructor has told students on the first day that only half of them would still be there by mid-semester. Since many instructors use the final standards for grading all papers, often students receive D's and F's on early papers. Although students who earned B's and A's in high school have a natural difficulty adjusting to earning the average college grade of C, these students have an unusual fear of

slipping to a D, a grade which may not meet graduation requirements and which may require repeating the course. A similar fear comes from non-teacher tests when students do not know whether contents of and standards for evaluating these tests are the same as for tests made by their instructors. Non-teacher tests are frequently given, as the following examples substantiate. At the City University of New York, students must pass state-mandated tests in both reading and writing before being allowed to take upper-division courses (Lederman & Ribaudo, 1981). At the University of South Carolina at Columbia, students must pass a state-mandated objective test of writing at the end of the first semester (Matalene, 1982). Students must "successfully complete an introductory composition course or its equivalent during their first year in college," according to the faculty of the College of Literature, Science, and Arts at the University of Michigan (Brengle, 1983, p. 6). Most commonly, students must certify their minimum competency in writing at the end of the freshmen year (Purnell, 1983).

Thus, too many freshmen approach further writing, if not reading, with distaste in part because they have taken a fast-paced and highly pressuring course which lacked due attention to natural psycholinguistic development.

Inadequacies of Methods for Reading and Writing

By what methods do freshmen carry out future tasks of reading and writing after completing a course designed to give practice in what methods? Often students will approach the required, university-level expository reading with no new, effective procedures for critical and

creative thought and feeling. Although some freshmen students can write what Hairston (1984, p. 198) calls "teacher papers" or formula papers readily, many students may lack methods of writing new university-level assignments. They may analyze fuzzily, synthesize incompletely, and evaluate unsoundly; and they may hand in first drafts poorly proofread.

Many freshmen who lack efficient procedures for reading and writing have taken product-oriented courses. In classes in which reading at the "instructional level" (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) is not taught per se, although some short essays on the "independent level" may serve as models for writing, there may be no attention whatever to methods of reading. Some writing courses are what Davis, Scriven, and Thomas (1981, p. 56) call the "product-performance" type which teach students to write five-paragraph themes containing an introduction, three body paragraphs, and a conclusion. When instructors merely assign freshman students to produce a certain number of such themes or products, students may produce them imitatively without understanding methods of writing. Other writing courses called "skills-centered" by Davis, Scriven, and Thomas (1981, p. 55) use such activities as sentence-combining and building basic skills through exercises in a workbook or in laboratory; and these courses run the danger of failing to give students adequate guidance in the steps in the process of writing papers.

Thus, too many freshmen carry out further tasks of writing by formula or without efficient methods in part because they have taken courses which focus on describing and assigning products, that is,

what is read and written, rather than on demonstrating and practicing processes, that is, how to read and write.

Inadequacies of Skills and Arts

How strongly do freshmen evidence the skills and arts of reading and writing through a course designed for teaching skills and arts developed in what strength? Reading skills of freshmen entering the university have dropped seriously in the last fifty years if students at the University of Minnesota are typical. Eurich (1980) reports that when tested by the same instrument, freshmen of 1978 scored significantly lower than the freshmen of 1928 in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and rate of reading. The freshmen of 1978 showed skills at least one grade level below the skills of seniors or juniors of fifty years ago. According to experiments, reading skills of freshmen who complete the writing-dominated coures have showed little or no measurable improvement. Nine experiments in which some aspect of writing was expected automatically and measurably to increase skills in reading were carried out. Although writing improved, the nine following resarchers report the following weak reuslts for reading: Hunt and O'Donnell (1970, p. 29), only for the linguistically deprived; Stedman (1971), higher level of significance for the linguistically deprived; Fisher (1974), in the present form, not significant; Shockley (cited in Combs, 1975, p. 30) "failed to verify a positive relation"; Magee (1979), for certain structures; Combs (1975), "somewhat ambiguous" (p. 92); Straw (1978), not according to the Nelson Reading Skills Test; Kerek, Daiker, and Morenberg (1980), not significant on a standardized reading test; and Ledesma (1981), tentative possibility. It must be concluded that

students' skills in reading are likely to be weak. In addition, students have been found to write mechanically (Barabas, 1980). As Irmscher (1977, p. 34) explains, if writing is seen "primarily as a skill," student and instructor "tend to concentrate on errors." According to Shuy (1981), the students tend to learn superficial skills in writing, such as spelling, mechanics, and punctuation, which lie above the level of syntax and often amount to the tip of the iceberg; however these students may not have learned deeper skills or arts, such as understanding meaningful relationships, recognizing language uses, and creating cohesion, which lie beneath the surface of syntax. Serious doubts are raised about the transferability of such weak or superficial skills.

Many of the freshmen who have weak skills have taken first-semester courses that form all or part of a writing program which severely restricts the direct teaching of reading and which emphasizes the skills unique to writing. When these courses center on basic skills, the basic skills may be "wrenched out of the context of meaning" (Shuy, 1981, p. 101). When these courses center on sentence-combining exercises and increase the length of students' independent clauses, the skill in sentence-combining does not necessarily enable students to write better a year later than do students who did not have such intensive sentence-combining (Kerek, Daiker, & Morenberg, 1980, p. 115).

Thus, many freshmen evidence skills in reading no stronger than at the beginning and skills in writing that are finely tuned but out of context in part because students have taken a course designed to teach skills unique to writing rather than to teach foundational,

strong, long-lasting, and transferable skills and arts of communication through both reading and writing.

In summary, there are inadequacies in some students' achievements at the end of the semester which are likely to influence future reading and writing. Some students perceive the goal of written discourse as mere correctness, regard writing with distaste, approach reading and writing without efficient methods, and develop weak skills in reading and limited arts in writing unlikely to transfer to other courses or serve as foundations for future learning. These inadequacies are associated with inadequacies in those first-semester English courses which provide "mindless service" (Booth, 1981, p. 16) through a goal of correct writing, pressure students to learn through a fast pace, merely require students to produce certain papers, and focus on skills relatively unique to writing.

These inadequacies are far from universal. Many freshmen communicate through written discourse excellently, and many first-semester courses assist students effectively. However, any inadequacies in freshman communication through reading and writing imply that difficulties will arise in such students' subsequent English courses, non-English courses, and post-university private and public lives. Thus, explanations for the problems when they do exist must be sought.

Explanations for Inadequacies in the Course and in the Instructional Activities

Some explanations for inadequacies in the course are drawn from the planning of the course. These explanations will vary from university to university, and also the explanations will overlap or

interact. However, four typical explanations will be placed in the categories Aristotle describes in Metaphysics (cited in Glenn, 1946, p. 94) for causal analysis: efficient cause, material cause, formal cause, and final cause.

Associated with explanations for inadequacies drawn from planning are explanations drawn from student activities and from instructional activities. "Instructional activities" are those educational activities chiefly in the control of the instructor of a class. "Instructor," used in the generic sense, means a person who teaches this course regardless of that person's academic status or rank. The instructional activities include methods of enlightening students concerning goals, pacing the progress of students' learning, explaining the content and giving practice in the skills and arts of the course, and evaluating results by examinations and other means. On the one hand, instructional activities are broader than merely explaining content and giving practice in the skills of the course. On the other hand, instructional activities are narrower than those educational activities which lie largely in the hands of planners, such as establishing goals, deciding the kind and number of students admitted into sections, providing the time and place of classes, and designating standards.

Initiating Inadequate Goals

What is the explanation for the initiation of what Booth (1981, p. 16) calls a "mindless service course" which tends to lead students to see the goal of writing as correctness rather than communication of critical and creative thought and feeling? To answer this question, one examines the history of the way goals have been set up. When

early American university graduates needed skill in oratory, four years, not a few semesters, of courses emphasized rhetoric, that is reading the classical orations and delivering newly written orations before peers and other audiences (Miller, 1982). After 1876, when writing frequently replaced public speaking, when professors of rhetoric such as James Francis Child found correcting freshman themes to their dislike, and when courses in specialized areas of literature sprang up as "English," composition was banished from Harvard and from other universities or relegated to high schools or given a secondary status within the universities (Ohmann, 1976). Later, when businessmen demanded graduates who could handle correspondence, a beginning course in composition which included reading some essays was set up and required to insure correctness of writing. After World War II and during the protest-filled 60's, when large influxes of new types of often-unprepared students entered, when professors felt driven to publish literary criticism or perish, and when logicians went to departments of philosophy and rhetoricians to departments of speech (Miller, 1982), the first-semester course in English further diminished attention to critical and creative thinking and feeling, the course often being taught largely by transient and overworked graduate assistants. Since 1970, when demand for advanced courses in and teachers of literature lessened, when English departments sharply bifurcated their role into teaching literature and teaching composition, when the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC or 4C's) represented divided halves of the profession, and when universities recognized the need to improve writing, the course emphasized

academic, organized, and correct writing but gave lessened attention to thoughtful reading, the course often being taught by transient and overworked part-time or non-tenure track instructors. Currently, when various stakeholders, such as non-English faculty members, administrators, or state officials make requests or demands, the goal of the course is altered. In short, since 1876, the goal is often planned to meet short-term, practical needs of various groups without adequate attention to students' long-term foundational needs to think and feel critically and creatively.

Some students, too, prefer that the goal of the course be a set of techniques immediately useful for business or technical discourse. Since instructors, according to a national survey (Kinneavy, 1982), value the goal of coherent communication more than the goal of mechanical correctness, many instructors merely read the official goal of the course once on the first day of class and do not express that goal broadly, repeatedly, enthusiastically, or deeply.

Thus, the students' perception of the goal of English as merely correctness after they have taken a "mindless" (Booth, 1981, p. 16) course is explained partly by some planners' preferring short-term goals rather than long-term goals of critical and creative thought and feeling as well as by instructors' one-time, matter-of-fact presentations of the goal to students.

Misjudging Students' Psycholinguistic Capabilities

What is the explanation for the fast pace and pressure of the course which tends to lead students to form a distaste for further written discourse? The assumptions of some planners concerning the

psycholinguistic capabilities of freshmen are implied in a review of the students' preparations, the efficacy of the pre-standard courses, and the requirements for completing the standard course.

Planners seem to undervalue the importance of students' state of preparation for written discourse in English. Students' preparations for a course in English may be excellent predictors of success in the course. In one study (Battle, 1980), students' preparation for the standard first course was measured by scores in ACT-English, the number of word-errors and sentence-errors made per one hundred words on the first paper, and age. The students' preparation measured this way, augmented slightly by whether students attended full-time or part-time, made it possible to identify with 97.5 per cent accuracy which of those students completing all learning activities passed the course. Preparation is a major factor in success.

Some planners have overestimated the preparation of entering freshmen. Actually, scores of high school seniors on College Board achievement tests in English have shown "consistent declines in recent years" (National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation at Risk," 1983, p. 11). In Brooklyn College, New York, 40 per cent of the entering freshmen failed the reading test (Brooklyn College Testing Office, 1979, cited in Bowles, 1981). At the University of California in 1975, 40 to 65 per cent of the beginning freshmen needed remedial English (McCurdy & Speich, 1979, cited in Bowles, 1981). At Ohio State University, 30 per cent needed assistance (Maeroff, 1976, cited in Bowles, 1981). According to professors at Indiana University, the decline in basic skills of university students is

caused by insufficient preparation at the secondary school level (Jacobs, 1982). Some of the students themselves state that they feel unprepared: at Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, 53 per cent felt "unready and unable" (P. Campbell, 1981) to cope with college reading and writing assignments. Several explanations for this lack of preparation are that "half of the newly employed English teachers in secondary schools are not qualified to teach" (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 14); that students lack instruction and practice (P. Campbell, 1981); that some students have personal shortcomings (P. Campbell, 1981); that there are negative influences from some homes (Denison, 1982); and that television is geared to the twelve-year-old mentality (Johnson, 1984, p. 237).

Poor preparation is not always forcefully remedied by the pre-standard courses in English. A questionnaire by Lederman and others (1984) responded to by 45 per cent of all universities in the United States indicates that almost all institutions provide courses in basic skills: 80 per cent offer courses in reading; more than 90 per cent offer courses in writing. In almost all of these institutions, instructors of the courses decide which students are prepared to enter standard English courses. According to evidence provided by Bowles (1981, pp. 2-3), the success of the pre-standard courses in "preparing students for the mainstream of college life" has been "limited." She explains that a "narrow view of reading and writing" and the administrative separation of reading classes from writing classes fail to address "a larger problem of literacy in general."

Some planners may also overestimate students' capabilities when setting requirements for completing the course as those requirements are expressed in teacher or non-teacher tests that are too difficult. For example, one university dropped the requirement that juniors or seniors pass a test in proficiency of writing but added the requirement that freshmen earn a C or better during both of the first two semesters of English. Planners who hold similarly high expectations overlook research on the young person's gradual development of physical capabilities (Chickering & Havighurst, 1981), cognitive capacities (Piaget, cited in Vander Zanden, 1981), ethical and affective capabilities (W. G. Perry, Jr., 1981), and linguistic capacities (Hunt, 1977) as well as the need for guided practice during every year of college (Kitzhaber, 1963, pp. 100-101). Planners' excessive expectations imply one or more assumptions. Planners may assume that learning communication through written discourse is a simple technical procedure perhaps analogous to filling a glass with water or that eighteen-year-old freshmen will not grow, develop, or mature. In either case, planners hold, in effect, a static psychology.

Compounding the problem of some planners' misjudgments of freshman capabilities is the fact that the standard course is frequently taught by instructors who are unfamiliar with students' capabilities and who are also unlikely to have strong impact on making plans or decisions concerning the syllabus of the course, suitability of texts, and standards for passing the course. According to a national survey (Kinneavy, 1982), instructors of the course at four-year universities were 54% graduate students, 19% part-time instructors, 13% untenured full-time instructors, and 14% tenured faculty members.

Students too misjudge their own capabilities and put pressure on themselves by working at part-time or full-time jobs, often limiting the quantity or quality of time for study.

Associated instructional activities are intended to intensify students' learning but sometimes parallel force feeding of plants. Some instructors assign readings, such as Francis Bacon's "The Idols" (1620/1968), that rank at what Bormuth (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) would call the "frustrational level." Then the instructors must give lengthy explications of such essays, taking undue time from writing. Some instructors assign writing that is similarly difficult, such as combining several simple sentences into one forty-word sentence. Students pressed in this way unduly increase their errors (Hake & Williams, 1979). Some instructors mark every error on every paper of every student. Although O'Hare calls this procedure "teaching error" (lecture, Fall, 1980), these instructors feel that they must use this method for several reasons: to help students as much as possible; to provide complete administratively required folders of students' papers; and to counter threats to their contract renewal, tenure, promotion, or merit raises from members of departments of English who demand this instructional activity.

Thus, the fast-paced and pressure-filled course which sometimes results in students' distaste for future written discouse is explained partly by some planners' assumptions that first-semester freshmen are prepared and are psycholinguistically developed enough to learn from transient instructors in one semester or sometimes two semesters what they need to know about writing to graduate, assumptions associated with instructional activities analogous to force feeding.

Emphasizing Products While Neglecting Methods

What is the explanation for some planners' designing a course which focuses on describing and assigning products and which tends to lead to students' lacking methods for carrying out further reading or writing? Planners of the course at one or more levels of administration seem to assume that the course is centered on technical knowledge that can be learned from lecture and textbooks and to assume, therefore, that instructors can help large numbers of students.

Some planners seem to assume that learning reading and writing involves passively amassing factual knowledge on rules of grammar and usage which students can readily apply to reading and writing assignments. It seems that students are to learn to copy rather than to think. Some planners of this first-semester course in English may visualize English classes as they were taught fifteen or more years ago by discussion of literature, review of grammar exercises, and assignment of writing; these planners would be surprised to observe that in order to give students guided practice in using methods of writing, instructors must often turn classrooms into laboratories by consulting with students in the midst of their in-class writing, by guiding peer editing, and by holding in-class conferences. Instructors of this laboratory-like course help students not with replications of experiments but with original works and not by checking a standard manual but by carefully suggesting improvements on each unique paper and providing weekly hours for individualized conferences. Nonetheless, the course lacks the two extra class hours

as well as the fourth credit-hour allotted to other laboratory courses.

Despite the difficulties of teaching and learning these complex processes of reading and writing, neither planners nor instructors have had the benefit of a clarifying and supportive body of research. Before 1965, when departments of English were bifurcated, little research into the process of university-level reading was undertaken; and studies in the process of writing progressed slowly (Blount, 1973). Few doctoral programs in English provided directly relevant courses.

Planners who assume that the course can be taught by in-class lecture and out-of-class assignments and who wish to increase credit-hour production sometimes assign too many students to sections of this course to permit instructors to guide students adequately. Three professional organizations of instructors in English, after giving detailed rationales, specify the maximum number of students it is possible to teach well. In 1981, the Modern Language Association's Commission on the Future of the Profession (1981, p. 2) stated that "in composition sections the number of students should not exceed twenty . . . ." In 1980, the Association of Departments of English (1980) stated that the students in a section should be 20 or fewer, and in no case more than 25 students. In 1977, the National Council of Teachers of English, College Section (1977, p. 873) stated, "Ideally, classes should be limited to 15 or 20," and "no more than 25 students should be permitted in any writing class." Still, one community college in California ran a study that found that students' scores on the Iowa Educational Development Test were statistically

significantly greater when English classes were limited to 100 students than when classes were limited to 35 students and used the study to justify continuing classes of 100 students (Silver, 1970) although the report is unclear concerning what the students learned in classes of either size. Planners have assigned over forty students to sections of the course in Texas (Kinneavy, interview, 1985) and to sections in Tennessee (Davis, interview, 1984). Compounding the problem of large class size is the assignment of three or even four sections of this course to one instructor. For example, thirty students in three sections of the course along with forty students in a sophomore course were assigned recently; such a teaching schedule is equivalent to six sections of professional size. In an apparent effort to insure that students have opportunities to learn, some planners require that instructors re-collect all papers from each student in each section, file these papers in chronological order in folders, provide a list of assignments, and turn the folders in at the end of the semester.

Hoping to find short-cuts, some students themselves press for simple formulas for producing products as well as occasionally copying papers meant to originate in class or even plagiarizing entire papers.

Associated instructional activities are somewhat more time-savingly product centered than process centered. The two most successful activities for teaching writing, according to a national survey (Kinneavy, 1982), are revision (72.2%), that is, suggesting improvements on students' original drafts and then reviewing the students' rewritten versions; and conferencing (44%), that is, discussing papers with students before, during, or after the time

students write the papers. Both process-centered activities are highly individualized and time consuming. To save time, instructors of large classes may abbreviate these procedures or may substitute less successful ones, relying heavily on product-centered approaches. In the models approach, instructors assign students to read examples of good writing, discuss the ideas, analyze the style and structure, describe principles, and ask students to imitate these examples or to apply the principles learned; these instructors can work with large classes although there may be little or no guidance in the methods for writing such ideal products. In "teaching the handbook" (O'Hare, lecture, Fall, 1980), instructors review exercises on improving incorrect sentences and later mark papers with the numbers of the rules in a handbook so that students may correct their errors; these instructors can make relatively quick criticism of students' papers although the students may not receive practice in methods to write future papers correctly or effectively. Instructors may handle overloads in other ways: some may limit their teaching time to forty hours and may give failing grades to students who have not learned from that amount of help or may give passing grades to undeserving students; others may work more than forty hours a week and may develop physical disorders from overwork, disrupt normal family and personal lives, or burn out from stress; still others may avoid teaching this course at all.

Thus, the fact that some students carry out future tasks of reading or writing either by formula or without efficient methods after they have taken a course that focuses on describing and assigning products is explained partly by the planners' assumption

that these little-researched, complex practical skills and liberal arts can be taught as a lecture course in three hours a week to a large number of students by instructors who use abbreviated instructional activities that are time-savingly directed to products rather than to methods.

Unsoundly Assuming That Learning Transfers Readily

What is the explanation for some planners' designing a course which emphasizes certain writing skills but slights "instructional" (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) reading and which tends to lead to little or no improvement in reading and to inflexible skills in writing unlikely to transfer? By focusing on the skills of written discourse, planners seem to make two assumptions: that teaching the skills and arts of reading expository literature is not important and that teaching the skills of reading or writing will automatically and measurably improve writing or reading as much as is needed.

The assumption that teaching reading per se is not important may be based on several misconceptions. Reading may be misconceived of as the decoding taught in elementary school which leads to skills at the literal level rather than being conceived of as the inferring, interpreting, and critical and creative thinking and feeling, appropriately taught at a university level. Also reading literature may be misconceived of as wasting students' time on fictional nonsense rather than being conceived of as challenging students to think and respond through bringing them face to face with writers of good prose in expository essays.

The assumption that since reading and writing are positively correlated, teaching either reading or writing will automatically cause the other skill to improve measurably is not borne out in experimental studies. Twelve experiments in expected transfer show that the relationship or correlation between reading and writing which does exist is not necessarily strong enough to amount to covariance, one element needed to establish causation.

Three experiments in which teaching some aspect of reading was expected automatically and measurably to increase students' skills in writing were undertaken. Although several forms of reading literature analytically helped students improve their reading, teaching these aspects of reading did not automatically and measurably improve students' writing. The following researchers report the following poor results in regard to improvement in writing: Calhoun (1971) no evidence; M. L. Perry (1980), not significant; and Couture (1981), success inhibited. Nine experiments in which teaching some aspect of writing was expected automatically and measurably to increase skill in reading were undertaken. Although several forms of writing compositions by combining short sentences into more powerful complex sentences helped students improve their writing, teaching this aspect of writing did not automatically and measurably improve students' reading significantly. The following researchers who used sentence-combining reported the following poor results in regard to improvement in reading: Fisher (1974), in the present form, not significant; Shockley (cited in Combs, 1975, p. 30), "failed to verify a positive relation"; Combs (1975, p. 92), "somewhat ambiguous"; Straw (1978), not according to Nelson Reading Skills Test; and Kerek, Daiker, and

Morenberg (1980), not significant on a standardized reading test. A few researchers reported slightly more favorable results: Hunt and O'Donnell (1970, p. 29), only for linguistically deprived; Stedman (1971), higher level of significance for linguistically deprived; Magee (1979), for certain structures; and Ledesma (1981), tentative possibility.

Possible reasons for the failure of reading to improve writing and writing to improve reading automatically and measurably within these experiments are that the instruments for measuring the outcomes were insensitive, that the time of the experiments was too short, and that only one aspect of the entire process of reading or writing was taught. Also, although there are similarities between the two skills, apparently there are enough differences so that students need direct instruction in both reading and writing with attention to all aspects of each--wording, sentence structure, paragraphing, and composing the essay overall--to facilitate measurable improvement in both. If there is no substantial transfer between reading and writing, it is difficult to imagine that there will be transfer to other courses.

Besides some planners' designing a course that tends to lead to students' developing weak reading and inflexible writing skills, students too act so as to reduce the likelihood of their developing transferable skills. Some students have been so long accustomed to objective tests that they have difficulty seeing the value of developing transferable skills; also some use psychological pressures on instructors to get a passing grade for credit in the course.

Associated instructional activities often become overly specialized. Sentence-combining may become an exercise in rephrasing

short sentences into dozens of different long sentences without relevance to a rhetorical framework, that is, the thought intended, the readers addressed, and the explanatory patterns needed. Doing exercises in grammar or punctuation in workbooks or handbooks runs the same risk of being too specialized and acontextual.

Thus, the freshman students' weak skills in reading and the inflexible skills in writing after some writing-dominated courses are explained in part by some planners' unsupported assumptions that instruction in reading essays is not intellectually important and that focusing on skills of writing will readily bring transfer of learning to reading and to other courses as well, assumptions accompanied by instructor's teaching specialized writing skills out of context.

In summary, inadequacies are explained by short-sighted actions of planners, students, and instructors. Since 1876, many planners have preferred short-term goals, overestimated psycholinguistic preparation and capabilities of freshmen, underestimated the time needed to teach methods of reading and writing, and assumed without support that instruction in reading is unnecessary and that specialized skills in writing transfer automatically to reading and other disciplines. Students too sometimes seek the easy paths rather than the roads to long-term success. In these circumstances, some instructors have used weak instructional activities. They may present the official goal cursorily, may pressure students to write error-free complex sentences, may use time-saving assignments of products while slighting methods, and may teach specialized skills in writing out of the context of long-lasting communication.

Although some planners have arranged excellent courses and some students have learned despite poor circumstances and some heroic and dedicated instructors have contributed to marvels of education, the numerous and varied inadequacies which do exist and have been explained in many ways must somehow be addressed.

Statement of the General Purpose of the Study

It has been established that by the end of the first semester in a university, freshmen need to communicate through both reading and writing English at a level that is acceptable for meeting their immediate academic and personal goals and that is sound enough to serve as a foundation for future growth. From the foregoing description of the planning of the course, it is clear that many educational practices that lie outside the control of an individual instructor should be altered to help students learn readily. For example, through serious philosophical reflection, consultation of research, and discussions with outstanding instructors and other educators, planners could add long-term goals to short-term ones. Planners could sequence the learning of reading and writing throughout high school and university courses to give students at every age gradual opportunities to learn from fully qualified instructors. Planners could assign the first semester course two hours of laboratory time and one added credit hour and limit the classes to twenty students. Planners could add attention to reading at the "instructional level" (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 856) and could institute reading and writing across the curriculum.

Although these many delimitations face an instructor and researcher, it is clear that strong instructional activities must be

developed. Even though an instructor or researcher cannot specify goals, a sound philosophy of communication that surpasses narrow correctness and activities to convey this philosophy to students must be formed. Although an instructor or researcher cannot eliminate all undue pressure from overly difficult standards and mandated tests, appropriate psycholinguistic expectations and ways to increase expectations of students gradually must be found. Though an instructor or researcher cannot reduce requirements for products set by planners, it is possible to use research to add some attention to methods of reading and writing. If reading cannot be given adequate attention in the course, an instructor or researcher can find ways to give some direct instruction in reading and can make suggestions for transfer of learning between both forms of discourse and to other courses.

The general purpose of this study is to develop thoroughy one coherent set of instructional activities for teaching communication to first-semester freshmen by learning activities in both reading and writing English to enable students to reach acceptable levels for meeting immediate and foundational goals. Such activities should be helpful to freshmen even though the activities cannot overcome all of the inadequacies of the course.

Particular Approach to the General Purpose: Relatonship Between Reading and Writing in the Course Setting

Since freshman need both reading and writing and since each must be taught directly to gain substantial improvement, the next consideration is how reading and writing can be related to each other

in the course setting. There are three major possible relationships: separate courses; a single course dominated by either skill; or a single, possibly enlarged course with reading and writing taught interrelatedly.

Separate courses have not been supported by the research of Bowles (1981), who reports that such courses at the pre-standard level fail to address the broad problems of literacy. Separate, required courses are not administratively feasible at the present time.

Single courses dominated by either reading or writing have already been shown through twelve experiments to bring inadequate improvement in the under-emphasized part of written discourse.

A single course with skills and arts taught interrelatedly must therefore be considered for this study. The first step in considering the interrelational approach is reviewing the theory and research in the literature. A later step is considering practical limitations of time.

The goal of teaching reading literature and writing compositions interrelatedly is now supported by thoughtful leaders in English. "Studying texts and creating texts are essentially compatible activities," according to the Modern Language Association's Commission on the Future of the Profession (1981, p. 1). Interrelating literature and composition was the subject of 16 sessions at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. Recent research, theory, or strategies on interrelating the forms of written discourse were presented at the CCCC, 1984, by such leaders as Corbett (1984), C. Cooper (1984), and Lunsford (1984). The broad philosophy of using both forms of written discourse as a means of learning the

content of non-English courses is rapidly being accepted among university faculty members; reading and writing across the curriculum are powerful educational activities (Weiss & Walters, 1981; Fulwiler & Young, 1982). Clearly there is growing support for the goal of teaching both reading and writing and for teaching them interrelatedly.

Research on students' natural development of abilities in reading and writing is provided by a psycholinguist, Vygotsky (1962); Vygotsky explains that the development of capacities for reading develop earlier than the capacities for writing although the capacities for both develop continually. Vygotsky's research implies that teaching reading at a given level of difficulty should continually precede teaching writing at that level. Teaching reading as a continual precursor to writing is especially important since writing is difficult to learn in any case and calls for highly "deliberate semantics--deliberate structuring of the web of meaning" (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 99). Using reading as a continual precursor for writing has long been practiced; for instance, the Roman Quintilian (Miller, 1982) taught listening, reading, speaking, and writing in that way. It seems that abilities in reading and writing grow upwards in two interrelated spirals with delightful reading precursing writing and with challenging writing adding incentive to sharpen reading. This continual interrelated development suggests continual interrelated teaching and learning.

The processes of reading and writing although not identical may have fundamental similarities which can be taken advantage of in the interrelated teaching of reading and writing. Researchers have found

significant positive relationships between particular measurements of some aspect of reading and particular measurements of some aspect of writing in correlational studies although these relationships have not been found to constitute covariance, one condition needed to establish causation. Researchers are finding relationships between more and more specific aspects of each skill. A strong correlation is reported by Kuntz (1975, cited in Heller, 1980, p. 3). A significant correlation of .13 between reading and writing achievements of 222 university freshmen is reported by Thomas (cited in Tang, 1979). A significant correlation of .50 is reported by S. Grobe and C. Grobe (1977). A "significant positive relationship between cloze test scores [of reading] and writing sample outcomes" is reported by Euster (1979, p. 69). Some significant relationships between scores on the Iowa Silent Reading Test and scores on two writing tests are reported by Fairbanks and Elliott (1981). A high relationship between reading and writing skills is reported by M. L. Campbell (1976), who adds that those who write better read better and those who write poorer read poorer. According to Heller (1980, p. 1),

> at least 10 elements of written language were significantly related to students' reading comprehension scores. Good readers' writing was characterized by longer T-units, independent clauses expanded through such nonclausal structures as prepositional phrases, intra-T-unit coordinators, and passive verb phrases. Poor readers' writing was characterized by shorter T-units expanded primarily through the addition of subordinate clause structures.

Non-correlational studies also point to similarities between the processes of reading and writing. Both readers and writers generalize from particulars and clarify relationships between generalizations and particulars, states Bowles (1981), describing the processes from a cognitive point of view. Both readers and writers

hear the voice of and interact with a "missing participant" states Bowles (1981, p. 31), describing the processes from a rhetorical point of view. Readers who observe the "plans" (Meyer, 1982, p. 37) of authors and hence improve their skills in reading are likely to transfer their knowledge of plans to their writing, states Bonnie Meyer, looking at the processes as a reading specialist. Both readers and writers must use special techniques to substitute for missing gesture, intonation, and facial expression of speech, states Hirsch (1977). Writing added to thought and discussion improves reading better than thought and discussion, explains I. A. Richards in Practical Criticism and How to Read (cited in Stotsky, 1975, p. 67). In short, there are fundamental similarities between the two processes which can be taken advantage of.

Whether teaching closely related skills interrelatedly tends to increase students' achievements is considered by cognitive-field psychologists and others whose theories and research affirm transfer of learning. A cognitive-field learning psychologist explains that the transfer of learning occurs "if and when--and only if and when--(1) opportunity offers, (2) a trained individual sees or senses it as an opportunity, and (3) he is disposed to take advantage of the opportunity. . ." (Bayles, cited by Bigge, 1976, p. 299). Teaching reading and writing in contiguity should offer implicit opportunity and antecedent training so that disposed students may make discoveries on their own or through their instructors' suggestions. Teaching closely related skills interrelatedly may bring the beneficial effects of the systems approach. The systems approach, which gives a person an overall view of some aspect of reality, enables that person to see

the parts of the system in relation to the whole (Hoetker, 1972) and often results in a synergistic effect. If students can comprehend the roles of reading and writing in relation to each other and to the whole of communication, they are likely to benefit from the synergism frequently resulting.

The approach to teaching both reading and writing by presenting them interrelatedly is consonant with the goals supported by leaders, research on students' linguistic abilities, similarities in processes of reading and writing, and theories on what is likely to facilitate synergistic transfer of learning. Since research suggests that the interrelational approach seems likely to produce deep, natural, broad, and transferrable results, the interrelational approach is theoretically worth studying.

The second step in considering the interrelational approach is evaluating practical factors. In order to give time for teaching and learning added skills and arts, this approach will probably require more than three hours of class time, more than six hours of homework time, and more than the usual time for instructors' outside-of-class activities. Such time is not at present administratively available.

Also there is no widely recognized set of instructional activities for teaching the standard course.

Thus despite problems that arise from planners and from students, and the limitation of inadequate time, it was advisable to develop a set of instructional activities. Future studies can address time, and future efforts can address problems arising from inadequacies in planning and student's learning activities.

Specific Purpose of the Study: Instructional Activities for Improving Both Reading and Writing by Teaching Them Interrelatedly

The specific purpose of the study will be stated and limited. The results of a search of the literature for previously established means of meeting this specific purpose are to be reported. The methods of proceeding in this study will be described.

Statement of the Specific Purpose

The specific purpose of this study is to develop thoroughly one coherent set of instructional activities for teaching communication to first-semester university freshmen through learning activities for reading and writing English presented interrelatedly within one standard course to enable students to reach levels acceptable for meeting their immediate academic and personal goals and sound enough to serve as foundations for future growth. Thorough development of this set of instructional activities requires four steps: finding research-based criteria for the instructional activities; describing the activities that are selected, modified, or created; evaluating the activities in a carefully observed one-semester demonstration; and suggesting any needed refinements in them. One limitation of the study is that it will not review time, neither the time suitable for teaching the course, nor the time used in teaching the course while doing the demonsration, nor the time students need for homework. Another limitation is that the instructor variable is not reviewed. Delimited from the study is any effort to fail to meet planners' requirements, such as planners' goals, number of students in the course, kind and number of assignments, and standards for grading.

The entire focus rests on developing thoroughly one set of instructional activities.

Search of the Literature

The search of the literature revealed no set of instructional activities already developed which meets all standards raised in the statement of the specific purpose. This set should have a philosophy of communication deep enough to serve as a foundation for long-term goals of reading and writing. The set should be based on a psychology that recognizes stages in the psycholinguistic development of first-semester freshmen. It should consider similarities as well as differences between learning activities of reading and writing at levels of the word, the sentence, the paragraph, and the essay. It should in addition to reaching levels acceptable for meeting immediate goals, use transfer of learning to help lay foundations for future growth.

The search of the literature produced not one such experimentally studied, published, full set of instructional activities designed especially for freshmen in the standard first-semester course in English. The search covered reading and writing at the college or university level published in educational periodicals and dissertations during the ten years preceding May, 1984. The search of the literature did, however, produce valuable relevant material.

The following will be reviewed: one full set of interrelational instructional activities for secondary school students, one full set of interrelational instructional activities for students in pre-standard university courses, and several partial sets of

interrelational instructional activities for first-semester freshmen in the standard course.

A major set of instructional activities for teaching reading and writing to students in secondary schools was developed and observed experimentally by Obenchain (1971). She held together her multi-level approach by what she called the "precise essay question" (p. 29). This question, asked by the teacher, is really a clear set of instructions to students who have read a piece of literature, directing them to write a composition to accomplish certain purposes by using either specified rhetorical patterns or syntactic structures or both. Her method failed to show significant improvement in reading as measured by a standardized test ($p < .06$) but showed significant improvement in writing as measured by writing samples ($p < .001$).

A major set of activities for teaching reading and writing interrelatedly to students in pre-standard university English is described by Bowles (1981). From substantial bodies of research in communication, language, and cognitive development, she derived ten criteria for designing materials for seven weeks of lessons. Her mechod's "try-out" did not show significant improvement in reading as measured by a standardized reading test, did show significant improvement in writing as measured by writing samples, and did show significant improvement in reading and writing combined as measured by an instructional test. However, according to this later instructional test which combined reading and writing, students did not show significant improvement in expository reading and writing, that is, the kind of discourse essential in the first-semester standard course. Besides this set of activities by Bowles, there are other sets

designed primarily for students in pre-standard courses, such as a set by Troyka (1973) and a set, called Foundations for Learning Language, by Central State University and Foundations for Learning Press, Inc. (1983).

Although the search of the literature revealed no full set of interrelational activities for helping first-semester freshmen in the standard course learn all aspects of reading and writing, it did reveal many instructional activities for teaching several aspects of reading and the corresponding several aspects of writing. A few examples are noted here. Bruffee (1980), emphasizes peer editing, students reading compositions other students have written and having their own compositions read in turn. Moran (1981) uses techniques for teaching creative writing as methods for teaching creative reading of fiction. Charles Cooper (1984) asks students to read essays which are precise models of various types of essays that he then asks students to write.

Valuable suggestions for this present study are implied in earlier research. Since partial sets of instructional activities which were used during short periods of a semester or less rarely resulted in measured improvement that is statistically significant for both reading and writing (Hunt & O'Donnell, 1970; Calhoun, 1971; Stedman, 1971; O'Hare, 1973; Fisher, 1974; Shockley (cited in Combs, 1975); Magee, 1979; Straw, 1978; Combs, 1975; M. L. Perry, 1980; Couture, 1981; Karek, Daiker & Morenberg, 1980; and Ledesma, 1981), it is important to use a full set of instructional activities during at least one full semester. Measurement of outcomes likewise should cover the whole of reading and of writing taught. At this point in

the study of the art, measurement of reading should be done by a scaled observational procedure rather than by standardized tests currently available for the university level. Measurement of writing should be done by means of a carefully scaled instrument for evaluating writing samples at word, sentence, paragraph, and essay levels. Clearly it is time to draw upon currently available research and the previously successful activities to develop thoroughly one whole set of instructional activities helpful for teaching the standard first-semester course of university English.

Method for Achieving the Specific Purpose

In this study, each of the steps in thoroughly developing a full set of instructional activities for freshmen in the standard course forms a chapter.

Finding criteria for selecting, modifying, and creating the instructional activities was accomplished by reviewing research and theory concerning the goals of communication, the psycholinguistic characteristics of beginning freshmen, the processes of reading and writing, and the transferability of expected results. This research and the succinctly stated criteria derived from the research are presented in Chapter II.

Describing the instructional activities selected, modified, and created was accomplished by presenting the activities in categories corresponding to the four criteria. Then the activities were formed into a usable plan for the first semester and into a typical two-week lesson for teaching one of the nine types of written discourse within the semester plan. The instructional activities are presented in Chapter III.

Evaluating these instructional activities formatively, in Scriven's (1973) concept, was carried out after demonstrating the instructional activities for one semester, using the semester plan and the lessons described. The demonstration was observed by quantifiable means--a questionnaire on strategies and a university-administered questionnaire on instruction; by qualitative means--interviews of students and the journal of the instructor; and by combined quantitative and analytical means--cloze samples and Goodman miscue analysis for reading and Buxton-scoring of writing samples with categories for rhetoric and correctness. The outcomes of all instruments were subjected to appropriate analyses. The outcomes of these analyses helped evaluate which activities seemed to be working and which activities or instruments needed refinement. This evaluation along with suggestions for advisable refinements in activities appears in Chapter IV.

The summary, discussion, and implications of findings appear in Chapter V.

Summary

Too many students leave the first semester of English without having achieved acceptable immediately practical or long-term foundational benefits in both reading and writing. These inadequacies are often associated with inadequacies in the course since planners frequently favor a short-term, immediately practical, marketplace orientation over a long-term liberating or practical-liberating approach and since instructors are pressed to use time-saving instructional activities. Thus, some students view reading and

writing as correctness rather than as critical and creative thought and feeling after having taken what planners call a service course and what Booth (1981, p. 16) calls a "mindless service course" in which instructors present goals cursorily. Some freshmen feel distaste towards future reading and writing after completing a fast-paced course which is designed by planners who overestimate freshmen's preparations and psycholinguistic abilities and which is taught by instructional activities similar to force feeding. Students sometimes lack methods for carrying out further reading and writing after completing a course planned on the assumption that the complex skills and arts of written discourse can be taught in three hours of lecture and assignments rather than through laboratory methods, by instructors who use product-oriented rather than method-oriented activities. Students develop weak skills in reading and inflexible skills in writing after completing a course designed by planners who omit reading instruction to stress writing strongly, the writing skills stressed often being taught out of context.

Though a researcher cannot change the course's goals, pace, required assignments, or stress on writing, a researcher can improve some instructional activities. It is possible to use research on the philosophy of communication to exceed minimum goals, on psycho-linguistic development to increase expectations of freshmen gradually, on methods of reading and writing to give students opportunities to understand and practice them, and on transfer of learning to provide opportunities for that transfer to occur between reading and writing and beyond.

Since both reading and writing are needed by freshmen and since both need to be taught directly to gain substantial improvements, a researcher must choose a course setting. Because many experts recommend the interrelational approach, teaching reading and writing interrelatedly in one course is advisable, although added time will probably be needed.

Despite delimitations associated with planning and limitations associated with time, the specific purpose of this study is to develop fully one coherent set of instructional activities for teaching communication to first-semester university freshmen in the standard course by learning activities in both reading and writing English presented interrelatedly within one course to enable students to reach acceptable immediate and foundational levels.

Criteria for these activities are derived from research in philosophy, psycholinguistics, processes of reading and writing, and principles of transfer of learning. Then, the set of criteria-based instructional activities selected, modified, or created along with plans for its use are thoroughly described. This set of activities is evaluated by a six-instrument observation of a one-semester demonstration. Last are suggested any needed refinements of the instructional activities.

This study should help instructors and planners assist first-semester university freshmen to improve their communication through written discourse immediately and to lay foundations for communication in the future.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE: FOUNDATIONS OF CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Introduction

The specific purpose of this study is to develop thoroughly one coherent set of instructional activities for teaching communication to first-semester freshmen through learning activities for reading and writing English presented interrelatedly within one standard-level course so that students can develop the skills sufficient to meet their immediate needs and the arts sound enough to serve as foundations for future growth. The purpose of this chapter is to review appropriate research and theory in order to derive criteria for selecting, modifying, or creating the instructional activities that will form the set. The set of activities based on these criteria is described in Chapter III, is evaluated formatively in Chapter IV as it was used in a one-semester demonstration, and in Chapter V will be refined as needed.

The review of research, though not exhaustive, is comprehensive, drawing upon several selected authorities in four areas. It focuses on research and theory that will meet students' needs and overcome as much as possible the inadequacies documented in Chapter I. The research for meeting students' needs to go beyond mere correctness to critical and creative thought and feeling comes from the philosophy

of communication and draws upon foundations of education. The research for helping to reduce pressured educational nurture comes from psycholinguistics and draws upon developmental psychology. The research for meeting students' needs for methods of reading and writing to balance needs for description of products comes from information processing and draws upon curriculum and instruction. And the research for adding flexibility to basic skills of reading and writing comes from studies in transfer of learning, drawing upon educational psychology.

Review of the Purposes of Communication in General, of Communication Through Written Discourse, and of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse

Freshmen need to learn communication at a level sufficient to meet their immediate purposes and sound enough to serve as foundations for future growth. When the goals of the first semester course in English are largely oriented toward correctness of reading and writing, they become "mindless service" (Booth, 1981, p. 16) goals and provide weak foundations for future learning. Although an individual instructor cannot usually establish goals of a course, a researcher can seek a philosophy of goals that is deep and broad. Such a philosophy of communication can be the "foundation point" (W. H. Howick, lecture on foundations of eduction, Summer, 1980) from which to see the officially required goals in the best light and possibly to add to those goals. Such a philosophy comes from research which falls into three categories: the purpose of communication in general, the purpose of communication through written discourse, and the purpose of freshmen communication through written discourse. This

research implies one criterion for selecting, modifying, or creating instructional activities.

Purpose of Communication in General: Dialogue

Ideally, the underlying purpose of communication is dialogue, that "serious address between two or more persons, in which the being and truth of each is confronted by the being and truth of the other" (Howe, 1963, p. 4). "Dialogue is that address and response between persons in which there is a flow of meaning between them in spite of all the obstacles that normally would block the relationship" (Howe, p. 37). Dialogue in this sense is as important to living as blood is to the body since it enriches by providing nourishment and cleanses by removing unneeded materials. Although not all exchanges reach this ideal, the goal is worth striving for. This kind of dialoguing among participants implies, in addition to clarity, effectiveness of asking questions and answering questions by some medium, such as gestures, speech, or written words.

The purpose of communication might also be described as "the rhetorical embrace," (M. Osborn, lecture on classical rhetoric, Summer, 1979) a definition implicit in Greek rhetoric. The strength of such communication comes from the present active participant's ethos, that is that person's credibility and insights; from the other participant's or participants' pathos, that is needs or desires; and from the medium of communication or logos, that is non-verbal or verbal language rich in logic, structure, style, figures of speech, sounds, and denotations. The practical strength of dialogical communication, stressed by Aristotle (L. Cooper, 1932), increases when the rhetorical work contains clear, logical thought; evidences the

rhetorician's awareness of the particular audience addressed; and contains orderly arrangement of facts presented in effective delivery, style, and grammar. The liberating and foundational strength of dialogical communication, emphasized by Plato (416-415 B.C./1956), increases when the truth is sought, the good of the other participants is desired, and the medium of communication is pleasingly beautiful. Genuine dialogue requires practical critical strength and foundational creative strength interrelated.

By contrast, non-communication may take the form of a monologue--one individual addressing no one. Or it may take the form of demagoguery--one individual making inflammatory and exaggerated claims before an audience of many.

Purpose of Communication Through Written Discourse: Recorded Dialogue

The main purpose of communication through written discourse is dialoguing by written or recorded words with the potential of reaching diverse peoples, living at vast distances, across long periods of time to convey "the best chat has been thought and known in the world" (Arnold, 1869/1952, p. 768). The special strength of dialogue recorded in script, comes from the fact that it can be re-read or rewritten so that the present active participant gains or gives full, accurate, and succinctly stated meanings. Thus recorded dialogue is not merely ordinary speech written down (DeBeaugrande, 1981) but rather a caring and "deliberate structuring of the web of meaning" (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 99).

Like dialogue of communication in general, dialogue through written or recorded words may increase in strength when the work concerns practical questions and answers presented in an orderly form

or foundational questions and answers presented by participants in a pleasingly beautiful way. In either case, although the script in which dialogue is recorded is physical and static, dialogue through the script is as open and fluid as, in Milton's (1664/1959, p. 443) words, a "streaming fountain." Strictly speaking, the reader does not gain the answer to a question nor does the writer give the answer to a question; all participants seek to discover or reveal what Kinneavy (1971, p. 19) in his communication triangle calls "reality."

There are some differences between dialoguing through reading and through writing. In general, reading tends to be re-creative or answer-gaining recorded dialogue and writing tends to be creative or answer-giving recorded dialogue. Some explanation is needed.

Reading is dialoguing that is re-creative or, in a broad sense of the term, answer-gaining. The readers "re-create," in Walter Kerr's (lecture on drama theory, Summer, 1950) term, what has been created by the author. Readers, having their own personalities and needs, begin by asking practical or foundational questions aroused by the author's introductory statements. The readers' questions lead to the author's answers; the author's answers lead to new questions until readers recreate the insights presented in the author's voice, thus arriving at comprehension. Contrary to the notion that reading is passive or automatic, reading, as described by Rumelhart, is highly "interactive" (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 289). So interactive is reading, according to Frederiksen's model (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, pp. 293-294), that reading leads almost directly to responding, sometimes in writing. This interactive dimension of reading can be taught, Bowles (1981, p. 31) states, by emphasizing the "missing participant"

that is the author, through using direct experience, such as oral interpretation or role-playing.

Writing is dialoguing that is creative or, in a broad sense of the term, answer-giving. Before making a draft, writers have at least partly created or, according to Aristotle (L. Cooper, 1932), invented their own insights or answers. They recognize the needs and personalities of their readers and arouse in these readers hope of answers. Writers plan a series of creative answers to readers' questions, giving the readers opportunity gradually to gain insight. Although writing seems entirely active, there is much reflection and passive waiting involved. While interaction with the "missing participant" (Bowles, 1981, p. 31) or readers is essential, such interaction is especially difficult since the readers for what is being written always exist in the future (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 99). To overcome this difficulty partially, an instructional activity of direct experience with the unseen participant, such as peer editing, should be used.

Purpose of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse: Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialogue

The main purpose freshmen have for communication through written discourse is beginning-academic recorded dialogue in both re-creative and creative forms concerning practical and liberating questions. Freshmen ask practical questions to comprehend clearly when they read re-creatively, and they give practical answers when they write with comprehensivity what they create. The subjects they ask practical questions about are the contents of the beginning required or core courses in the humanities and the sciences. They ask questions of

beginning-academic audiences, that is, the authors of their texts and their seen or partially hidden instructor of this course or instructors of any rank in other courses. These dialogues occur through textbooks, handouts from instructors, essays for English, and "outside reading" for other courses. When they write, freshmen provide practical answers concerning the content of their courses for their instructors in the forms of essay examinations which are sometimes based on lecture notes; reviews of plays; laboratory reports; short papers; and summaries of "outside readings"; or they write memoranda on their jobs. They use beginning-academic recorded dialogue to learn so as to pass their courses.

Freshmen also ask long-term, foundational questions in reading and provide long-term answers in writing in the courses just described and sometimes on their own. They ask deep questions about religion and philosophy, seeking truth, sustaining vision, and a way of life. They recognize authors whose intentions are generous and try to benefit from them. And they appreciate the articulateness of effective authors of the self-development books and literature they choose to read. When freshmen write their long-range thoughts in or out of class, they present new insights into life, show awareness of their audiences, and write in the form of academic papers as well as of journals or letters home.

It is interesting to note that the first-semester course of English may emphasize students' personal growth, a popular emphasis in the late Sixties; may center on service to the readers in the form of correctness, a popular center before the late Sixties; or may focus on the language used as a medium of communication when such an activity

as sentence-combining forms a large part of the course, a contemporary focus. It is possible, however, to give balanced attention to the student, the people the students will come into contact with, and the language. Such a balanced approach which gives attention to all three elements of dialogue is proposed in this study.

Criterion

From these sources comes the first criterion for selecting, modifying, or creating instructional activities to teach freshmen communication through written discourse. These activities, while facilitating immediately practical correctness, should contribute to that liberating dialogue which occurs when a thinking, truth-seeking freshman-participant as re-creating reader or creating writer interacts with unseen participants, that is beginning-academic authors or audiences, by means of an ordered series of ideational stated or implied questions and answers recorded in script. In addition, "dialogue" will serve as the unifying principle of and the language for describing the entire set of instructional activities.

Review of the Characteristics of Communicators in General, of Communicators Using Written Discourse, and of Freshman Communicators Using Written Discourse

Some freshmen feel distaste toward future reading and writing after completing a fast-paced course designed by planners who overestimate the freshmen's preparations and psycholinguistic abilities and which is taught by instructional activities similar to force feeding. Though instructors usually cannot eliminate inappropriate expectations, a researcher can discover through studies in psychology and psycholinguistics suitable expectations with

sufficient depth and breadth to serve as foundation points for sequencing learning activities so as to increase expectations of students gradually. This research on the roles of educational nurture and natural growth suitable for communicators in general, communicators through written discourse, and freshman communicators through written discourse leads to one criterion for instructional activities.

Characteristic of Communicators in General: Developed Authenticity in Dialoguing

Dialogical communicators are already or are becoming authentic, open, and disciplined (Howe, 1963). Such communicators become authentic or become more authentic through educational nurture in which another person helps improve their abilities in the use of language and through natural growth which improves cognitive and affective capacities. What are the roles of educational nurture and natural growth in becoming authentic?

People tend to become more authentic through the educational nurture found in formal or informal education. Growth in authenticity, according to Howe (1963), comes through invitation from another person who is authentic, sometimes a teacher or friend who is distant enough to be objective, is present enough to students to share their understandings, and is skilled enough in some area of reality, such as mathematics or history, to enable him or her to use the language in that area as the means of communication, a language which is taught to the student.

People also tend to become more authentic through their own development of natural capacities. According to Piaget's study (cited in Vander Zanden, 1981), humans tend to pass through natural

stages in such growth. Between two and seven, children in the preoperational stage feel themselves as the center of the universe and use symbols, especially language, as if they provide the same information as the objects they represent. Between seven and eleven, young persons in the stage of concrete operations recognize the conservation of mass, discriminate between symbol and referent, but still believe their mental constructs are a superior form of perceived reality. From approximately eleven to twenty years or later, young adults in the stage of formal operations become capable of regarding at least certain aspects of reality objectively and abstractly and of using hypotheses and deductive reasoning. It is understood that there is a great range in the ages at which these stages occur, if they do, and in the particular aspects of reality in which the capacities appear.

Thus, people become dialogical communicators, that is persons who are authentic, open, and disciplined through both nurture and nature. Educational nurturers must consider natural development in contributing to authenticity.

Characteristic of Communicators Using Written Discourse: Developed Authenticity in Recorded Dialoguing

Communicators using written discourse become authentic in recorded dialoguing through nurture and nature. There are many indications that the right educational nurture at the right time in natural growth is helpful in becoming readers and writers who are authentic.

The first question is: Do the natural capacities for being nurtured in the skills and arts of reading and of writing come into

being at the same level of complexity simultaneously? According to Vygotsky (1962), a psycholinguist earlier referred to, young people tend to develop natural capacities for acquiring skills in reading earlier than they tend to develop capacities for acquiring skills in writing, although the capacities for both develop continually. Students, according to Conlin (1981), can read sentences of higher syntactic complexity than they can write. Such research implies that nurturing instruction in reading should occur at an advanced level of complexity simultaneously with instruction in writing at a lower level of complexity. It is especially important that reading be taught thus since reading and writing are correlated and since educational instruction or nurture in writing "must build on barely emerging, rudimentary [natural] processes" (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 100). Reading can serve as a continual precursor to writing, always slightly more complex.

The second question is: Are both nurture and nature involved in adults' learning reading and writing? Three pieces of research provide an answer.

The relationship between nurture and nature in writing sentences was empirically observed by Hunt (cited in Cooper & Odell, 1977), whose findings have been replicated. According to controlled observation, the average words per independent clause written by students in the fourth grade is 5.4, and this average length increases gradually year by year until writers in the twelfth grade reach 11.9 words. Students also gradually develop abilities to write structures of increased complexity in this order: coordinating subject and predicates, forming appositives, transforming predicate adjectives to prenominal

adjectives, changing predicates to adverbs, altering predicates into prepositional phrases, and forming absolute phrases (Hunt, cited in Cooper & Odell, 1977). These observations suggest the role that natural growth plays. Unskilled adults, that is adults not nurtured by higher education, averaged 11.9 words per clause; but skilled adults, that is educationally nurtured adults, averaged 14.8 words (Hunt, cited in Cooper & Odell, 1977). Nurture also plays a role.

The roles of nurture and nature in students' writing of full-length compositions was studied in an excellently controlled, six-months' experiment by Buxton (1958). A control group of randomly assigned students did not write papers at all and received no instruction in writing papers; a second group wrote papers regularly but received no instruction; a third group wrote papers regularly and received instruction through corrections on their papers, in-class suggestions for improvement, and required revision of all papers, thus writing more than the second group. The research hypothesis that students who wrote regularly without instruction improved more than students who did not write at all was confirmed ($p < .01$). More important, the research hypothesis that students who wrote with instruction improved their compositions more than students who wrote regularly but without instruction was also confirmed ($p < .05$). This finding implies a significant role for educational nurture.

The roles of educational nurture and natural growth in students' reducing errors in compositions was researched in a four-year longitudinal, landmark study by Kitzhaber (1963). Through guided, nurtured writing, Dartmouth's students in first-semester freshman English reduced errors from a mean of 24.5 per thousand words

at the beginning of the semester to 16.2 at the end; through similar guidance, students in second-semester freshman English reduced their errors to 13.8. However, students who were unguided during their sophomore year increased average errors to approximately the error rate they had at the beginning of their freshman year--24.4. Students who were unguided, as Kitzhaber points out, from sophomore to senior year increased their average errors beyond those they began with as freshmen and reached 33.7 errors per thousand words (p. 109). Although the senior's increase is not entirely attributable to lack of nurture, clearly educational nurture helps students rid writing of errors. Both nurture and nature are important.

Since both nurture and nature are involved in improving writing, an instructor must consider the next question: Is there a right educational nurture for a particular natural stage of development? One of the following studies illustrates under-nurturing in relation to continuing natural growth; the other illustrates what may be over-nurturing in one area of writing in relation to natural growth.

A second look at Kitzhaber's (1963) longitudinal study of errors in compositions highlights the fact that seniors increased average errors beyond what they had made as sophomores, 24.4, and as beginning freshmen, 24.5, and reached the mean of 33.7. The students' increase from the end of the freshman year to the end of the sophomore year, 13.8 to 24.4, is explainable as due at least partly to lack of guided nurture, an explanation given by Kitzhaber (pp. 100-101). But since graduating seniors' errors increased beyond that number, added explanation must be sought. Hunt's (1977) finding that young writers tend to develop syntactic length and complexity with age suggests

that, in addition to writing on more difficult content, the seniors had developed capacities for writing longer independent clauses and more complex structures, such as absolute phrases and prepositional phrases formed of predicates. Thus, one can conclude that Kitzhaber's seniors had lacked both the nurture to maintain their original skills and the nurture needed to handle new powers and problems that surfaced with natural development. These seniors were under-nurtured as writers in relation to the abilities developing naturally.

The Kerek, Daiker, and Morenberg (1980) landmark experiment of comparing the sentence-combining method of teaching writing with a traditional method was done in two years. At the end of the first semester of the freshman year, the research hypothesis that sentence-combining helped freshman writers improve more than a traditional method was confirmed ($p < .001$). Then it was assumed that both experimental and control groups of students received approximately the same lack of nurture in writing and grew naturally in syntactic maturity and in other ways at approximately the same rate during their sophomore year. At the beginning of the junior year 28 months later, the null hypothesis that students taught by the traditional method wrote better than the students taught by the intensive sentence-combining method was not rejected. Thus, although much research has shown that the sentence-combining method is undoubtedly a valuable activity for teaching writing, one cannot conclude that the intensive nurturing of students by using this method at one point in the students' natural development is likely to bring superior lasting effects.

The fourth question is: What is the importance of establishing the right relationship between educational nurture and natural growth to the authenticity of communication through written discourse? The importance of the right relationship between nurture and nature in relation to authenticity is expressed in the Harvard Report (1952):

> The ability to organize and express ideas is not a skill which is acquired at a given age [through nurture and nature] and then simply put to use; it is a function of the total growth of the mind [nurture and nature] and must develop as experience of life broadens and deepens . . . . Verbalizing [through over-nurturing] must never outrun real understanding based on experience. (p. 116)

Thus it seems that the right nurture at the right time in natural development contributes to assuring authenticity of persons communicating through written discourse.

Characteristic of Freshman Communicators Using Written Discourse: Developed Authenticity in Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialoguing

In order that freshmen become persons who are authentic as beginning-academic communicators through written discourse, educational nurture should be right for the natural development of a freshman in at least three areas: biological life cycle; ethical or value-system development; and readiness for reading and writing various modes of discourse, lengths of sentences, and degrees of syntactic and semantic correctness.

Educational nurture should be right for a freshman's natural development in the biological life cycle, the cycle set by physiological age. In general, a person's point in the life cycle determines what a person is interested in (Chickering, lecture on the future American college, Spring, 1983). First-semester freshmen of typical college ages, seventeen to twenty-three, are likely to be

performing many of the tasks specified by Chickering and Havighurst (1981) for the ages from sixteen to twenty-three. These tasks are associated with leaving home, that is, breaking psychological ties, choosing a career, entering work, handling peer relationships, managing a home, managing time, adjusting to life on one's own, problem-solving, and managing the stress accompanying change. These areas make suitable topics for the content of reading and especially of writing and facilitate authenticity.

Educational nurture should be right for a freshman's stage of intellectual and ethical or value-system development. In general, a person's stage in life helps determine how the person learns best and is taught best (Chickering, lecture on the future American college, Spring, 1983). A freshmen is likely to be in any of three stages of intellectual and ethical development. Of the freshmen at the beginning college age of eighteen who were reported on by Weathersby (1981, p. 58), 16% were self-protective or, in W. G. Perry's term (1981), dualistic; they tended to see life in terms of all-true or all-false, all-ugly or all-beautiful, or all-bad or all-good. Such freshmen want the "correct interpretation" of a piece of literature read, believe that the instructor knows "it," and expect the instructor to tell "it" (Burnham, 1983). They also expect "correct" answers to questions of English usage from the authority-instructor and expect explicit examples of writing which they can imitate. Corresponding teaching practices are lecture and examination. Of the freshmen reported on by Weathersby, 52% were conformists or, in Perry's term, in the stage of multiplicity. These students tended to seek social approval and acceptance and to favor law and order in

larger social contexts. They accepted standards and expectations held by significant others, especially their instructors. Corresponding teaching practices are teacher-led dialogue and "learner-centered" discussion. Of the same groups of freshmen, 31% were performing at the conscientious or, in Perry's term, in the relativistic stage or above. These freshmen are concerned with individual rights, recognize multiple views but seek congruence and simplicity, and employ the scientific method and logical analysis. They have internalized standards of excellence. Appropriate teaching practices are programmed learning, correspondence study, televised instruction, and computer-assisted instruction. Interestingly, by the age of twenty-one, the age of many university juniors, 81% of the sample had reached this third stage or a higher one.

Since freshmen are likely to be in any of the three stages which affect how they learn best, it seems that instructors might begin with teaching activities most helpful to the first stage, then use those most helpful to the second stage, and last try those helpful to the third stage. Also, according to Chickering (1981, Spring, p. 23), it is advantageous to pitch teaching one stage higher than a student's current stage. Often strong support to a student in carrying out activities in the current stage enables the student to discover and move into a higher stage and continue becoming authentic.

Research indicates that certain modes of written discourse, types of syntax, and degrees of freedom from errors are appropriate or right expectations for freshmen in relationship to natural development. Listed from simpler to more difficult, the modes of discourse, are traditionally considered to be narration, description, exposition, and

argumentation. Although students in pre-standard English in Bowles' (1981) research improved under her method at a .95 level of confidence in writing narrations and descriptions, they did not improve similarly when writing the more difficult expositions required of freshmen in the standard course. Consistent with Piaget's (cited in Vander Zanden, 1981) research on stages of cognitive development, university freshmen in the first semester of the standard course are likely to be capable of decentering--of attending to several aspects of a situation simultaneously; they may be reaching towards or have reached the stage of formal operations--capable of regarding at least certain aspects of reality objectively and of using hypotheses and deductive reasoning. Thus, most freshmen should be capable of learning to write expository essays and, with considerable instruction, of learning to write simple arguments. Their reading can be more advanced, including somewhat more complex expository essays and also arguments.

The length of independent clauses and types of intra-sentence structures freshmen use in their writing are described by objective observors. In the twelfth grade, according to Hunt's study (cited in Stewart, 1978, p. 45), seniors wrote an average of 11.45 words per independent clause. Beginning freshmen tested by Stewart wrote 12.25 words. Freshmen have probably mastered the coordination of subjects and predicates, formation of appositives, transformation of predicate adjectives into prenominal adjectives. and alteration of predicates into adjectives; they probably have not mastered the alteration of a predicate into a prepositional phrase or the formation of the absolute phrase (Hunt, cited in Cooper & Odell, 1977). It is important not to nurture skill in verbalization out of proportion to natural capacities.

The expected degree of freedom from semantic and syntactical errors and the way instructors should treat errors are also described by close observors. In a study of freshmen with a wide range of abilities, all serious and minor errors per hundred words were tabulated. Students who passed the course usually made a mean total of eight or fewer errors per hundred words, and those who failed made nine or more (Battle, 1980). Incidentally, underprepared students who were pressed to learn both university-level and high-school-level skills during one semester of standard English increased their errors (Battle, 1980). Also since students who are overly pressed to combine short sentences into longer complex ones may unduly increase errors (Hake and Williams, 1979, p. 139), it has been suggested that students be taught the upper levels of sentence-combining only when they are ready for it, that is only they have become or are well on the way to becoming proficient writers.

The number of errors that instructors should mark on each paper remains an open question, since some educators advise marking only one type of error in each paper and other educators insist that every error on every paper during the entire semester should be marked. In a quasi-experimental study of the effect of marking errors in papers of students in two developmental classes (Battle, 1981), no difference at the .05 level of significance in students' improvement was shown among marking one-third, marking two-thirds, or marking three-thirds of the students' errors. However, students who had one-third marked expressed enjoyment in writing, but those who had all errors marked as well as having revisions and exercises required strongly disliked the course. Further, instructors can perhaps be most helpful to

reduction of errors if they study the sources of errors for likely causes (Lyons, 1984) and adjust their terminal and marginal comments accordingly.

Criterion

All activities, rather than being under-nurturing or over-nurturing in relation to natural development, should help freshmen students develop authenticity as question-asking and question-answering persons by varying teaching methods to help students reach towards the next higher stage in life, probably one in which they set their own standards; by using reading that is more complex than writing; by favoring subjects associated with leaving home; by eliciting expositions and simple arguments; and by expecting relatively error-free sentences formed of independent clauses approximately twelve words long. This type of developmental education might best be carried out in what Bruner (1960, p. 52) calls a "spiral curriculum."

Review of the Methods of Communicating in General, of Communicating through Written Discourse, and of a Freshman's Communicating Through Written Discourse

Explanation for the sometimes unbalanced, superficial, or abbreviated activities for teaching communication through written discourse is the fact that planners have allowed such an inadequate amount of time to teach a little-researched, complex, skills-oriented discipline to so many students that some instructors tend to describe products to be re-created or created rather than the methods whereby to re-create or create them. Though instructors probably cannot fully overcome the insufficiency of time for laboratory activities, a

researcher can find and use research that, without omission of description of products, focuses on processes of communicating through written discourse. This research should be broad and deep enough to serve as a foundation point for methods of learning and teaching of both reading and writing. The research will be reviewed in three categories: the method of communicating in general, the method of communicating through written discourse, and the method of a freshman's communicating through written discourse. From this research, a criterion for instructional activities will be derived and stated.

Method of Communicating in General: Process of Interacting Through Dialogue

Communicating is not comparable merely to mechanical, one-way transportation of information (Communication, 1969, p. 203) or to "a physical quantity such as mass or energy" (Information Theory, 1969, p. 246B), as some theorists propose. Monologue can become dialogue (Howe, 1963, p. 36) when one participant lays aside his defenses and begins "experiencing the other side" (Buber, cited in Howe, 1963, p. 38). Making this change from monologue to dialogue requires "correlative thinking, a thinking that looks for reciprocal relations between things, between persons, between meanings and truth, between theory and practice, between little meanings and ultimate meanings" (Howe, p. 42). For example, correlative thinkers see both their side and the other person's side of an issue. Real dialoguers become aware of the barriers between themselves and the other or others, that is, everyone's defenses, anxieties, purposes, stereotypes, or language rigidities. The dialoguers, without compromising their beliefs, after coming to terms with their own self-created barriers, and after risking the possibility that they may have to change their positions,

listen to and accept the concerns and barriers and feelings of threat of the other participants. They make these concerns the subject of the dialogue, thereby enabling themselves to find perforations in the barriers. Such dialogue may be carried out by any method, such as informal discussion, creative lecture, group processes, audio-visual experiences, case studies, and other means so long as there is "a true address and response in which each informs and learns" (Howe, 1963, p. 50) and hence there is real "meeting" (Buber, p. 11). In other words, this process helps participants approach what Kinneavy in his communication triangle calls "reality" (1971, p. 19). Seeing the products or the examples of this process or having the resulting products described, though valuable, can not be substituted for engaging in the process itself.

Method of Communicating Through Written Discourse: Process of Interacting Through Recorded Dialogue

It is highly challenging to interact through recorded dialogue, and the long-term benefits can be proportionately high. Although all aspects in the process of resolving interpersonal and social problems are important, much of the research has focused on the linguistic aspects of the process.

"Basic to all reading and writing" explains Squire (1983, p. 581), is skill in processing language." Understanding processing of language involves discovering whether the steps in reading and writing are serial or recursive and whether readers and writers process from the discrete parts to the whole or from the whole to the parts.

The processing of language in reading as described by early researchers occurs in three "stages" (Chall and Clark, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 288) in a series: "encoding, comparing, and recoding." This serial approach seems to favor learning discrete skills before learning broad overall skills in a down-up approach. More recently, five stages in the reading act were described by Frederiksen (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 293): receiving graphic senstions, generating the structure of information, generating sentence structure, interpreting syntax to generate related propositions, and generating new propositions from given information. These stages are diagrammed as recursive; almost every action in the process reflects back on, continues, or perfects an earlier action or actions. Nine operations during reading, such as provision of connections that were unstated and clarification of linguistic incompleteness by ascertaining the referent of a pronoun, are identified by Lapp and Flood (1978). The recursiveness of stages in the process emphasized in recent research leads to modification of the down-up approach to learning to read. Squire (1983) states:

> One does not learn to read only by completing an endless series of discrete practices on isolated reading skills . . . . Our task is to teach students how to relate the various subskills in achieving a totality of meaning . . . by teaching the specific skills in a holistic context . . . . (p. 585)

One especially valuable way to help students "relate the various subskills in achieving a totality of meaning" is the seventh step in one method of teaching reading. The seven steps are teacher's preparation, provision of readiness activities for students, instruction, drill and practice, evaluation of accomplishments, follow up, and provision for enrichment activities (Kaiser, lecture on

modern reading, 1982). The last step, provision for enrichment activities, helps students synthesize the subskills to achieve "a totality of meaning" (Squire, 1983, p. 585).

The products of reading are important; they may be briefly described here as the skills of literal, on-the-line comprehension; inferential or between-the-lines comprehension; and critical or beyond-the-lines comprehension (Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 296) and the arts of intensive, interpretive, and creative comprehension. The products may also be described as the evidence of such comprehension in speech, writing, or actions. Nonetheless, the products are understood as being achieved by a "dynamic, active process" (Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 299).

The processing of language in writing as described by Rohman (1965), an earlier researcher, occurs in three serial steps, pre-writing or invention, writing, and rewriting. Actually, many early classes in English emphasized only the rewriting stage or even the proofreading part of the rewriting stage. Also, many early textbooks organized information on writing as if one subskill should be mastered at a time in a down-up approach, moving from information on correct words to correct sentences to well-developed paragraphs to the whole coherent essay. Recent research summarized by Ann Humes (1983, pp. 205-212) indicates that competent writers know the four subprocesses of composing: planning, that is generating and organizing content and setting goals; translating, that is transforming thought into graphic representation; reviewing, that is judging what has been done and what remains to be done; and revising, that is mentally changing the content, structure, and the actual text. The

steps in the process of writing are now regarded by De Beaugrande (1981) and many others as being recursive. The contemporary emphasis on the recursiveness of steps modifies the down-up approach to learning to write. One does not "learn to write," Squire (1983, p. 585) comments, "by facing only endless sequences of 'itty, bitty' sentences and paragraphs" but rather by seeing "the relationship of part to whole . . . within a total context."

The products of writing are often thought of as the skills and arts of literal and intensive comprehensibility, inferential and interpretive comprehensibility, and critical and creative comprehensibility. The products may also be described as compositions that evidence such comprehensibility, for instance by being unified, developed, and coherent. Important as products are, they are not substitutes for processes. Thus, comprehensibility, the product, requires practicing "the total process of constructing and reconstructing ideas" (Squire, 1983, p. 585).

Method of a Freshman's Communicating Through Written Discourse: Process of Interacting Through Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialogue

The method whereby freshmen communicate through written discourse is to think correlatively when interacting with unseen participants by means of following recursive steps in the process of beginning-academic recorded dialogue. A number of authorities outline such practical steps.

For freshmen's reading essays, four steps are described and shown in Trimmer and Hairston's The Riverside Reader (1981). The steps are (1) pre-reading of title, author's biography, and place of publication; (2) reading straight through for a main impression or for

the author's main point; (3) re-reading for understanding the process of writing, especially the plans (Meyer, 1982, p. 37) or schemata (Lunsford, 1983) whereby the author created the product; and (4) writing a short response to talk back to the author. The pre-reading step (1) includes, according to Trimmer and Hairston (1981, pp. 5, 10), predicting what the the author might say. During the re-reading step (3), readers become aware of the plans or schemata that the author used consciously or unconsciously in arranging the parts of the discourse and in assuring coherence of thought and feeling.

A more complete set of highly recursive stages, one to be used in this study, is expressed in dialogical terms. The first two steps emphasize inferential and interpretive reading; the next two emphasize literal and intensive reading; the next two emphasize critical and creative reading; and the last permits enjoyable reading at what Bormuth (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978), p. 586 calls the "independent level." The recursive steps are the following:

(1) focused reading of the entire text straight through for the main question the freshman reader asks when the author addresses him or her, and for the main answer or response the author eventually provides;

(2) broad reading for the sub-questions the freshman reader asks and the sub-answers the author provides which eventually lead in an ordered series to the overall answer, a series called plans or schemata;

(3) close reading for understanding facts and details, that is for creating or interpreting the author's supporting experiences and feelings which have suggested partly through figurative language;

(4) intensive re-reading, preferably orally, to experience the author's voice suggested by the sounds of words, rhythm of sentences, and punctuation;

(5) evaluative reading by critically checking the author's answers with the freshman's own and with other criteria;

(6) public reading, that is sharing or responding by discussing what is read orally with others or by writing about it; and

(7) free and wide reading for enrichment and fluency, especially of essays on the same question using different patterns of development.

Freshmen reading at a level defined as "independent" (Bormuth) can abridge many of these steps. Freshmen reading at the "instructional level" (Bormuth) will benefit from practice in all steps.

For freshmen's writing of essays, five steps are described and demonstrated by Memering and O'Hare (1984) in Writer's Work, 2nd ed. The steps are (1) pre-writing (remembering, observing, participating, imagining, and researching); (2) writing non-stop an initial draft of one's own thoughts; (3) re-writing or revising, especially considering one's readers, thereby forming a working draft; (4) re-writing the final draft, especially concentrating on the introduction and conclusion; and (5) proofreading. Pre-writing (1), receives attention from many experts. "Invention" is the name given Aristotle's (L. Cooper, 1932) advice for consideration of the ideas, audience, and arguments. To help students invent their own thoughts by asking themselves numerous questions about an assigned topic, Burns (1983) has written a computer program. Small-group activities designed by Hillocks, Kahn, and Johannessen (1983) enable students to develop such skills as comparing and contrasting by using real objects, and these activities seem to improve writing even more than sentence-combining does. The non-stop writing (2) is consonant with Krashen's (1977) research that shows students must turn off their monitor while expressing their own thoughts, deferring criticism until later in the process. Re-writing (3 and 4) has received attention from Quintilian (cited in Miller, 1982) when he discusses arrangement,

from Lunsford (1983) when she discusses schemata and from Bonnie Meyer (1982) when she describes writer's plans. Some instructors prefer to separate the rhetorical steps (1-4) from proofreading (5) by focusing on correctness in a separate place, such as a laboratory, or at a separate time (Winterowd, 1981).

A more complete set of highly recursive stages, one to be used in this study, is expressed in dialogical terms. The first two steps describe critical and creative thought and feeling and contribute to forming the essay-as-a-whole and the paragraphs; the second two center on providing readers with experiences that are expressed in sentences and words; the next two give attention to reviewing for improvement and praise; and the last step provides independent enjoyment.

(1) focused writing for clarifying the freshman writer's main answer and for establishing the audience's actual or likely opening question, probably providing the writer a way to address readers in the introduction;

(2) broad writing for forming a series of sub-answers and sub-questions, the plans or schemata, which lead to the main answer;

(3) close writing for providing particular readers with details and figures of speech that will aid them to experience the writer's general answers;

(4) intensive re-writing or revising so as to voice the author's concern for his readers through sounds of words, rhythm of sentences, and punctuation, a step which includes proofreading;

(5) evaluative writing by checking for the readers' likely reactions, using the observations of helpful others, and considering a variety of criteria;

(6) public writing or sharing one's writing by some form of publication, especially one permitting a response; and

(7) free and wide writing of additional texts for enrichment and fluency.

Though experts can abridge many of these steps, freshmen can benefit from all of them.

Freshmen who tend to learn best by one or another of the four learning modes described by Kolb (1981) are likely to carry out certain steps in the process of dialoguing thoroughly and other steps superficially, according to experience of this researcher. Freshmen who learn best by what Kolb calls abstract conceptualization tend to gather or express main ideas thoroughly through focused and broad discoursing (1 and 2); but they tend to find close discoursing and re-discoursing (4 and 5) so repetitive and time-consuming that they must be reminded often of those readers who need substantiation to understand general statements. Freshmen who learn best by active experimentation dislike reading and writing expositions and arguments, prefer public discoursing (6), and seem to regard written discourse as being guided by a set of rules of the game which is won partly by chance and rewarded with an A; so they need steady encouragement to read and write well (1 through 4). Freshmen who learn best by concrete experience tend to carry out the discoursing quickly (1 and 2), readily pick up feelings and sensations (3 and 4), and enjoy reading and writing freely (7); but they must be instructed to carry out focused and close discoursing (1 and 2) at several different sittings since they carry out these steps superficially. Those freshmen who learn best by reflective observation begin by finding the supporting points (2 and 3), criticize a bit severely (5), and hesitate to share (6); but they benefit from individual comments and conferences to help them to learn to synthesize (1) more quickly and gain confidence. Even if steps in the processes of reading and

writing can be stated generally, each freshman dialoguer will need to adapt them to his or her own abilities.

Criterion

From these sources comes the third criterion for selecting, modifying, or creating instructional activities to teach freshmen communication through written discourse. These activities should, without omission of describing and requiring products, facilitate freshmen's engaging in "correlative thinking" (Howe, 1963, p. 42) by carrying out all seven recursive steps of the interactive processes of both reading and writing, relating the parts--paragraphs, sentences, and words--to an "all-embracing meaning" (Squire, 1983, p. 585). Activities for carrying out all seven steps for both reading and writing should be included at least briefly when reading and writing each of the nine forms of chiefly expository written discourse presented during a semester.

Review of the Results of Communication in General, of Communication Through Written Discourse, and of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse

Freshmen need two somewhat overlapping types of results from learning communication through written discourse. They need practical skills and affective arts to read expository discourse with comprehension and to write essay examinations and reports with comprehensibility; and they need foundational abilities in communication through written discourse that are strong enough to carry over into further, somewhat different reading and writing and into other actions as well. The weak skills in reading and inflexible skills in writing that some freshman students demonstrate after having

taken certain writing-centered courses are explained by some planners' unsupported assumptions that reading is not intellectually important and that skills in writing will readily transfer to reading and to other courses. These unsound assumptions are accompanied by instructors' teaching skills out of context. This review seeks research on the expected immediate improvement in skills in both reading and writing but especially on those expected foundational abilities of communication that are likely to transfer. Even though instructors must help freshmen develop the skills of mere literacy, instructors can use research on transfer of learning to devise activities likely to gain abilities in true literacy which seem likely to transfer.

It will be recalled that transfer of learning occurs, according to Bayles (cited in Bigge, 1976, p. 299), "if and when--and only if and when--(1) opportunity offers, (2) a trained individual sees or senses it as an opportunity, and (3) he is disposed to take advantage of the opportunity." When a person develops strong skills of critical and creative thinking and feeling, the person can be considered "trained" (2). If the person has developed affective arts of responding and valuing, the person can be considered disposed (3). These strong skills and arts along with the art of reversing will be considered foundational abilities. When such an able person is presented reading and writing in contiguity, the person will be thought to have an opportunity (1) to transfer learning from reading to writing and writing to reading. From research on the results of communication in general, results of communication through written

discourse, and results of freshman communication through written discourse, a criterion for instructional activities will be derived.

Results of Communication in General: Transferable Abilities in Dialoguing

The results of learning communication in general are not only certain practical skills and affective arts but also liberating foundational abilities. Learning ordinary communication develops cognitive skills to help give or gain information and affective arts which help convey emotions and values. Although these skills and arts overlap in reality, they are described separately. Foundational abilities leading to extraordinary communication will also be described.

Learning ordinary communication should develop the communicator's cognitive skills, especially the skills of critical thinking, which tend to bring about chiefly practical results. The cognitive skills, listed in terms of Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives in the cognitive domain, are skills in acquiring knowledge, comprehending, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating. These skills used in public communication tend to bring such results as consensus on public issues and support for a strong national defense to counter internal and external threats. In short, these cognitive skills, result largely in information-gaining and information-giving.

Learning ordinary communication develops the affective arts, especially those of value creation and integration, which lead to personal results. These arts, in terms of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia's (1964) taxonomy of educational objectives in the affective domain, are abilities to be aware, to be willing to give or to

receive, to respond, to value, to organize a value system, and to build values into oneself. For example, communicators learn arts of exercising self-control, of respecting others, and of trusting (Howe, 1963). These arts, carried out in less-public circumstances tend to bring such results as personal peace, friendships, and community (Howe, 1963, p. 106).

Occasionally ordinary communication becomes "more than communication" (Howe, 1963, p. 107). Learning ordinary communication thoroughly can lead to especially strong cognitive skills, affective arts, and foundational abilities which, if opportunity offers, may contribute to extraordinary communication. Such occurrences, writes William James (1958, p. 327), "add a supersensuous meaning to the ordinary outward data of consciousness." These occurrences are called by Martin Buber (1923/1958) I-Thou relationships. Maritain (1948/1956, p. 28) describes what happens during some such events as "the intellectual intuition of that mysterious reality disguised under the most commonplace and commonly used word in the language, the word to be." The great artist-communicator, according to Jacques Copeau (cited in Battle, 1954, p. 56), understands "how to SEE" and to draw "the innermost songs from things and beings." These special forms of communication, which may be accompanied by a "solemn euphoria" (William Clark Cox, III, course in literature, Spring, 1965), result in what Zen masters refer to as enlightenment (Reps, 1957). It seems that extraordinary communication leads especially to arts, such as painting, music, or poetry.

Results of learning communication in general are that communicators gain cognitive skills in information-gaining and

information-giving that tend to result in technical public achievements and that communicators gain affective arts of experiencing human relationships which tend to result in harmonious intra-personal and inter-personal growth. On occasion, extraordinary communication occurs.

Results of Communication Through Written Discourse: Transferable Abilities in Recorded Dialoguing

The results of learning communication through written discourse are refined cognitive skills, especially inference and critical thinking, and balanced affective arts, especially value creation and integration, which comprise literacy. If the person is strongly trained and strongly disposed, he or she has developed some foundational abilities for transfer. If that person also has the opportunity to see reading and writing in relation to each other, the result can be the foundational ability of reversibility which leads to what Johnson (1984, p. 235) describes as true literacy and which is especially likely to transfer. Although they overlap in reality, these cognitive skills and affective arts and the foundational abilities will be presented separately.

Learning communication through written discourse should result in refined cognitive skills at the literal, interpretive, and critical levels. These skills may be expressed in terms of Bloom's (1956), taxonomy of educational objectives in the cognitive domain. Those who learn communication through written discourse develop skills in receiving knowledge after asking authors clear, exactly-worded, fact-finding questions or skills in giving knowledge by clearly, exactly, and factually writing answers to readers' questions. They gain skill in comprehension and comprehensibility when they carefully

combine their own thoughts with those of other participants, grasping new answers. They learn application by using previously observed patterns of fully expressed logic in fully deployed sentences of clear structure when they dialogue with authors and when they write to their own audiences. They develop skill in careful analysis and argument by breaking a major question into logical sub-questions or a major answer into sub-answers. They learn controlled synthesis by integrating sub-questions or sub-answers into overall questions or answers. They learn sharp evaluation through distancing themselves temporarily from the text and using objective criteria for judging the text's content, argument, and form. These refined cognitive skills tend to lead to such further practical results as accurately exchanging information across vast distances, solving complex problems in science and technology, and integrating past discoveries with present research.

Learning communication through written discourse should develop balanced affective arts at the intensive, interpretive, and creative levels. These arts may be expressed in terms of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia's (1964) taxonomy of educational objectives in the affective domain. Those who communicate through written discourse learn to be keenly aware through placing themselves in the psychological state of the other participant, developing pathos. They learn generous willingness to receive through questioning authors and through risking questions from their own audience of readers. They learn responsiveness through openly appreciating answers provided by authors and by providing meaningful and creative answers in reply to readers' implied questions, developing ethos. They improve valuing through reflectively distancing themselves from someone else's and their own

texts, and through regarding the texts on the basis of criteria, such as the esthetic effect. They learn careful organization of value systems through bringing together individual insights and answers so as to discover underlying significance or insights. They learn to build high values into themselves by actively or persuasively sharing self-discovered meanings or insights. These balanced affective arts can lead to such results as exchange of attitudes between diverse peoples, spreading humanities across vast distances, and development of long-term cultural values.

Taken together, these refined cognitive skills, especially of critical thinking, and these balanced affective arts, especially of value creation and integration, lead to literacy, the ability to read texts with comprehension and to write texts with comprehensibility. Literacy tends to lead to communication that reaches people of wide diversity at vast distances, and across long periods of time.

Learning communication through written discourse can result in especially strong skills and arts which serve as foundational abilities. An additional, especially strong foundational ability is likely to occur from interrelating reading and writing: the ability to reverse the two actions so as to transfer learning gained from each type of discourse to the other. If people formally or informally educated are disposed and are given opportunities to see specific relationships and connections between reading and writing--between their purposes, contents, processes, and/or products--, they can transfer learning from one to the other and discover their own heuristics for further reading and writing. Such persons, states Greene (cited in Johnson, 1984, pp. 235-236) "go beyond what they are

taught and begin teaching themselves," becoming "truly literate persons" (Johnson, 1984, p. 235). Research in both reading and writing supports the possibility of acquiring this ability to transfer meaningfully from reading to writing and writing to reading.

Relating reading to writing can help people learn some skills and arts of writing. Through analytic reading, which uses linguistic examination of texts, people can learn linguistic tools by which to observe large and small units of prose and can discover heuristics for developing ideas in writing (Couture, 1981). To make this transfer, people then practice using these features through activities in revising, summarizing, and paraphrasing, activities which merge reading with writing skills (Couture, 1981). These activities teach people such devices as defining beginnings, middles, and endings and as establishing parallel relationships between rhetorical, grammatical, and informational structures.

Relating writing to reading can help people learn some skills and arts of reading. Through expressive writing without instruction for ten minutes a class period, according to Collins (1982), students in a pre-standard English class gained important benefits for reading. Such writing helped them discover ideas, connections, and relationships which had been abstract or elusive. For instance, the students who organized their own thoughts on paper were ready for added understanding of how the authors they read organized their thoughts. It was important, Collins noted, to enhance the transfer of learning between writing and reading by helping students see connections between their written thoughts and the thoughts of the

authors they read and then to focus on other similarities, such as those in organization.

True literacy, which occurs, according to Greene (cited in Johnson, 1984, pp. 235-236), when people "go beyond what they are taught and begin teaching themselves," has a special result. Truly literate persons tend to gain "freedom--the ability to see things, not just as they are, but as they should or could be; the ability to structure and restructure conceptually the world" (Johnson, 1984, p. 236).

Under certain circumstances, the arts of true literacy can promote learning in general and the clarity of the concepts learned in particular (Weiss & Walters, 1981; Squire, 1983). First, the person must be trained and possess heuristics for reading and for writing that have the qualities DeBlois (1980) describes as generative capacity, flexibility, and transcendency. Also the discourser must possess appropriate prior world knowledge (Squire, 1983, p. 587) in the particular area, and he or she must be disposed. Finally there must be opportunity for applying the skills and arts of reading and writing in the other area or discipline. These conditions are met, for example, in a project using learning-centered writing. Learning-centered writing, which is designed to help learning through problem-solving and which requires neither use of academic prose nor evaluation by an instructor, has proved successful. Weiss and Walters (1981) had instructors in four different disciplines teach two sections apiece, one section using learning-centered writing and one not using writing. Although students did not improve skills in writing, the section in which learner-centered writing was done had

significantly higher gains in learning the content of the course than sections in which no writing was assigned. The greatest superiority appeared in the clarity of the concepts learned by writing over the clarity of the concepts learned without writing (Weiss and Walters, 1981).

In summary, learning communication through written discourse can lead to refined cognitive skills of accurate information-gaining and information-giving and balanced affective arts of experiencing human relationships, the two abilities together resulting in literacy which tends towards public achievements and personal and interpersonal harmony. If the skills and arts are strong enough, they become foundations for future learning. Seeing and practicing reading and writing in relationship to each other can lead to abilities in a type of transfer, that of reversing the two activities, of transferring aspects of one to the other activity, and of discovering broad heuristics, for further use, leading to that true literacy (Johnson, 1984) which in turn leads to liberation or freedom and to vision and energetic action. Finally, if it is applied in other disciplines, true literacy tends to bring an increase in the concepts learned and in the clarity of the concepts learned.

Results of Freshman Communication Through Written Discourse: Transferable Abilities in Beginning-Academic Recorded Dialoguing

In thirteen weeks, freshmen can reach the already described results to only a limited extent. They can improve cognitive skills of accurately gaining and giving information to a specific degree and improve affective arts to a limited degree, tending to develop beginning-academic literacy adequate to meet immediate needs. If

these cognitive skills are strong enough and affective arts are strong enough, they can serve as foundational abilities likely to transfer. If academic reading and writing are learned in interrelationship so that there can be opportunities for some transfer from each to the other, freshmen can discover heuristics for transfer and can reach a beginning-academic true literacy. If and when opportunities for written discourse are given in other disciplines, freshmen can also increase their learning of those disciplines. Descriptions of these skills and arts and foundational abilities appropriate for first-semester freshmen follow.

Expected cognitive skills in reading range throughout what Lapp and Flood (1978, p. 296) call literal or on-the-line understanding; inferential or between-the-line understanding; and critical or beyond-the-line understanding of beginning university-level texts that are written for beginning-academic readers in the simple expository methods defined earlier. Skills expected in reading at each level may be expressed in terms of Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives in the cognitive domain. Literal or on-the-line understanding is important and requires skills in gaining knowledge of exact facts and details, perhaps evidenced by accurate paraphrasing. Inferential or between-the-line understanding is more important and requires skill in comprehension through closely reading sentences to discover the author's logic and to distinguish between fact and opinion, perhaps indicated by summarizing; skill in analyzing an essay into steps, such as definitions, illustrations, comparisons, contrasts, classifications, causes, effects, steps in a process, and reasons, perhaps shown by forming a sentence outline;

and skill in synthesizing the supporting thoughts into a main thought, forming a generalization, perhaps indicated by writing a thesis sentence. Critical or beyond-the-line understanding is most important and requires evaluating accurately according to some criteria, possibly indicated in a critical peer review, and requires applying through sharing readings with others and reading somewhat different texts. These skills should enable freshmen who begin at a low instructional level of 42% on a cloze test of a beginning university-level passage to improve during thirteen weeks approximately one-third of the distance to the high instructional level of 57% on a cloze test of similar materials, that is to 47% (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586).

Expected cognitive skills in writing range throughout literal, inferential, and critical comprehensibility in expressing beginning university-level thoughts, such as those of freshman writers in the first two essays in each section of Memering and O'Hare's Writer's Work, 2nd ed. (1984), to readers who are freshman peers or instructors of beginning courses, by using the largely expository modes defined earlier. Skills at each level may be expressed in terms of Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives in the cognitive domain. Literal comprehensibility is important and requires skills in giving knowledge of facts and details accurately, perhaps through choosing exact nouns, verbs, and other words; using standard spelling and semi-formal usage; employing correct mechanics, such as correct capitalization or abbreviation; and formating neatly. Inferential comprehensibility is more important and requires skill in expressing logical thoughts, indicated by soundly grammatical, well-punctuated

sentences; skill in forming the essay of steps, such as definition, illustrations, narrations, examples, comparisons, contrasts, classifications, causes, effects, steps in a process, and reasons, perhaps marked by transitional devices; and skill in expressing or strongly implying a synthesized thesis or generalization, which probably appears in a major sentence of each paragraph, of the introduction, and of the conclusion as well as being suggested in the title. Critical comprehensibility is most important and requires skill in evaluating one's own composition by some criteria, such as unity, development, and suitability, probably indicated by editing and proofreading; and skill in applying, observed by revisions and by additional writings. These skills should enable students to write a 500-word essay containing an introduction, two to four body paragraphs, and a conclusion. Each body paragraph should have a stated or implied thesis sentence and developing facts presented in logical order marked by transitional devices. Sentences should be complete, well punctuated, and grammatically coherent. Words should be accurate, well spelled, and adequately formal. There should be no more than a total of eight major and minor errors in semantics and syntax per hundred words, of which probably no more than one error should be major.

These cognitive skills in reading and in writing together result in clarity and correctness of gaining and giving beginning-level academic information to help students learn well enough to pass their courses. These cognitive skills should be combined with affective arts of written discourse to form beginning-academic literacy.

The affective arts of freshman communication through both reading and writing range throughout the levels of intensive or on-the-line experiencing; interpretive or between-the-line experiencing; and creative or beyond-the-line experiencing. The arts expected are limited to experiencing beginning-college-level insights, involving college-level audiences, and expressed by simple effective methods. Insights into life, ideas or needs of other participants, and notions of esthetic effect are those of freshmen in typical life cycles or stages defined earlier. Skills at each level may be expressed in terms of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia's (1964) taxonomy of educational objectives in the affective domain. The intensive level is important and requires arts of showing awareness of sensory impressions through sense-appealing details, suggested in vivid and connotative nouns, verbs, and other parts of speech. The interpretative level is more important and requires arts of showing an open willingness to receive and give, suggested in fluent, appropriately varied, effective sentences, containing figurative language, such as allusions and irony; arts of showing responsiveness to others, indicated through asking and answering sub-questions in coherent psychological order, heightened by such rhetorical devices as humor or mock-seriousness; and arts of evidencing values by recognizing or expressing the central felt-significance in a text, especially notable in the introduction, topic sentences or paragraphs, conclusion, and title. The creative level is most important and requires arts of showing organization of values through connecting new and old values, conveyed through persuasiveness of the writing; and building values into oneself, evidenced through sharing, discussing, orally interpreting, and

adding relevant reading and writing. These arts of effective composition enable freshmen to become mature beginning-university students. Odell (1979) points out that mature writers reveal not merely syntactic maturity but also many other abilities; they observe that their audiences differ from themselves, can provide any needed background for statements, persuade readers by seeking common ground with the other participants, try to foresee and respond to the other participants' likely questions or objections, show awareness of other views on their subject, admit their own limits, take notice of facts that seem to be contradictory, and consider an experience from several sides. The affective arts in re-creation, or reading, and creation, or writing, tend to increase the maturity or humanity of freshmen so that they lose their freshman bravado or their fears and feel sensibly confident about proceeding further into the academic life.

Thus freshmen who develop cognitive skills and affective arts of communication through written discourse at previously specified levels develop beginning-academic literacy. They read beginning texts with comprehension and write texts for . ady comprehensibility in a beginning-academic fashion.

The conditions for transfer of learning (Bayles, cited in Bigge, 1976), briefly stated, are training, disposition, and opportunity. By developing inferential and especially critical cognitive skills and by developing interpretive and especially creative affectional arts, students are likely to be well prepared, educated, or trained. It would seem that the affective arts would help students become disposed. Teaching reading and writing interrelatedly should provide

opportunity for transfer of learning. If these conditions exist, two types of transfer are likely to occur.

The first type of transfer may occur when communication through reading and through writing is taught and learned in interrelation, that is, when reading is taught for its own sake and also to help writing and when writing is taught for its own sake and also to help reading. Freshmen have the opportunity of reversing the actions in the seven recursive steps in the process of beginning-academic reading and writing. Students can see the relationships, can develop heuristics, and can practice applying the heuristics.

Reversing activities can occur at each of the seven steps and in each area of a text--the word, the sentence, the paragraph, or the overall essay. Some examples at the level of the essay are provided here. First, freshman readers who see that the author is arousing an opening question in his readers can write so they themselves arouse an opening question in their readers; freshman writers who begin with a question-arousing statement can in turn look for more complex opening statements by the authors they read. Secondly, freshmen can understand through reading and writing that sub-questions and sub-answers move step-by-step towards an overall answer. Thirdly, the freshman reader who recreates an author's facts, details, images, and figures of speech can write so as to feed the readers with details; the freshman writer who has struggled to present experiences in detail knows how much he or she wants readers to value every word and pays attention to an author's words when reading. Fourthly, the freshman-reader's reviewing details of an author's style is reversed when the freshman-writer sharpens his own sentence structure and

diction. Fifthly, a freshman reader who evaluates someone else's works with a large measure of objectivity prepares to evaluate his own work with objectivity; and a freshman writer who evaluates his own work with sensitivity is preparing to evaluate an author's work with sensitivity. Sixthly, the freshman readers who share their understanding of an author through oral interpretation, through writing, or through discussions are preparing to have their own work shared and reviewed. Wide reading enriches the freshman's relish for writing just as wide writing increases the freshman's wish to read.

There are at least two limits to reversibility. In Chapter I, it was shown that teaching reading does not automatically and measurably increase writing and vice versa; since there are some differences between re-creation or reading and creation or writing, both reading and writing must be taught directly. First, a student's seeing possibilities of reversing activities and making the transfer usually requires that a knowledgeable instructor, provides appropriate instruction like that carried out by Collins (1982), who used expressive writing to teach reading, and by Couture (1981) who used analytic reading to teach writing. Second, freshmen who read material at an "instructional level" (Bormuth, cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 278) cannot be expected to write in a similarly complex way; for example, though freshmen can be instructed to read expository essays containing classifications made on the basis of two interrelated criteria, freshmen cannot be expected to reverse that pattern of classification at that level when they write essays, probably being limited to classifying according to a single criteria.

Learning reading and writing in interrelation can result not only in reversing actions but also in developing fundamental heuristics for future use. These heuristics should have generative capacity, flexibility, and transcendency. When students "go beyond what they are taught and begin teaching themseleves" (Greene, cited in Johnson, 1984) the further result is beginning-academic true literacy. From seeing the parts--reading and writing--in relation to the whole--communication through written discourse, freshmen can gain a synergistic effect. The reading eyes and the writing hands of freshmen become strong, increase in flexibility, and contribute forcefully to liberal education.

A subsequent form of transfer may also occur if certain conditions are met. Freshmen who have developed beginning-academic true literacy can improve their learning elsewhere. The freshmen must be given additional world knowledge (Squire, 1983) or training. The heuristics they have learned must have generative capacity, flexibility, and transcendency (DeBlois, 1980), probably facilitating students' disposition to transfer. Freshmen must be given apropriate opportunities to apply the cognitive skills, affective arts, and the heuristics in the new discipline (Squire, 1983). These conditions can be met in interdisciplinary programs, team teaching, programs for reading and writing across the curriculum, and classes of concerned instructors. Then although freshmen may not automatically and measurably further improve their writing, they are likely to improve learning of concepts in that discipline and clarity of the concepts learned in that discipline (Weiss & Walters, 1981). Although most of

these conditions cannot be met in this study, the cognitive skills, affective arts, and heuristics should have the requisite qualities.

Criterion

From these sources comes the fourth criterion for instructional activities to teach reading and writing interrelatedly to university freshmen. These activities, without neglecting cognitive, especially critical, skills and affective, especially creative arts of written discourse, should provide freshmen opportunities to see relationships between reading and writing, to gain transcendent heuristics for relating reading and writing, and to practice transferring learning from each form of written discourse to the other at all stages of the processes and at all levels from the word to the entire essay, leading in the ultimate direction of beginning-academic true literacy, that is enabling freshmen to learn how to teach themselves dialogue through written discourse. If instructors in other disciplines were to provide appropriate opportunities to freshmen, instructors could increase students' learning of concepts and the clarity of the concepts learned.

Summary

The four criteria for developing the instructional activities can be succinctly summarized. These instructional activities for reading and writing should be oriented not merely to correctness but especially towards beginning-academic recorded dialogue; be suited not merely to serviceable correctness of assistance to others but especially to the authentic development of university freshmen; be focused not merely on the product but on all the recursive steps in

the processes of interacting through both reading and writing; and result not merely in beginning academic literacy but also in synergistic transfer of learning from each form of discourse to the other, contributing to true literacy.

Next, these four criteria will be used to design a coherent set of activities for teaching the two complementary halves of written discourse interrelatedly. The resultant set of instructional strategies is described in Chapter III.

Chapter III

DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO MEET CRITERIA FOUND IN THE LITERATURE

The specific purpose of this study is to develop thoroughly one coherent set of instructional activities for teaching communication to first-semester university freshmen through learning activities for reading and writing English presented interrelatedly within one course to enable students to reach levels acceptable for meeting their immediate academic goals and sound enough to serve as foundations for future growth. The need for a set of activities was established in Chapter I. The search of the literature to establish criteria for designing the set of activities was completed in Chapter II and covered four areas: purposes of communication, psycholinguistic development of freshmen, processes of communicating by reading and writing, and potential outcomes of interrelatedly teaching reading and writing. Briefly stated, the four criteria established are that the set of activities should be oriented towards dialogue, be suited to the development of first-semester freshmen readers and writers, cover all steps in the processes of both reading and writing, and facilitate transferring the skills and arts of each activity to the other.

The purpose of this chapter, Chapter III, is to describe the coherent set of instructional activities designed to meet these four criteria. This set of activities about to be described has been

constructed from several sources. Some activities were selected from traditionally used activities or from activities developed by identifiable persons. Some activities are modifications of already-known activities. Many activities were created. In Chapter IV, a closely observed and evaluated demonstration of this set of activities will be reported; and in Chapter V, any needed refinements of this set of activities will be presented.

Each activity in the entire set of instructional activities meets the four criteria fully stated in Chapter II. These instructional activities will be presented, however, according to the criterion with which they are most closely associated.

The first section of this chapter presents one major underlying activity for conveying the philosophy of dialogue which permeates the course. This instructional activity evolves into three sub-activities for reading and three sub-activities for writing.

The second section describes five activities for sequencing the learning opportunities from easier and basic to difficult and secondary. Taken together, these activities outline the chronological plan for the entire first semester.

The third section describes activities that facilitate the students' carrying out the processes of communication by written discourse. The processes of reading and writing have seven steps each. For each step of each form of written discourse, one activity is designed and described. These activities will then be placed into a two-week lesson plan for teaching one type of essay, comparison and contrast. This lesson plan can be varied for the other eight types of essays.

The fourth section contains four activities which help freshmen become aware of the relationships between reading and writing, practice transferring the learning from each activity to the other, and uncover heuristics for further transfer.

Activity for Emphasizing the Dialogical Nature of Communication: Centering the Course on a Definition and Three Implied Questions

Some courses in first-semester freshman English focus on narrow, servile, "mindless" (Booth, 1981, p.16) goals of correct writing sometimes set up partially for the immediate and short-term benefit of others rather than for the freshmen themselves. An instructor of this course, usually unable to alter the official goals of correctness and knowledgeable of how to meet them, can seek a broad and deep philosophy of freshman communication through written discourse so as to design activities for surpassing the official goals or presenting them in their best light. Here freshmen communication through written discourse is conceived of not merely as serviceable correctness but above all as <u>dialogue</u> between a truth-seeking freshman reader or writer interacting with and for the good of unseen academic authors or audiences by means of an orderly series of stated or implied ideational questions and answers.

To convey this goal to freshmen, an instructor must use an instructional activity. This activity will be centering the course on the definition of dialogue and the three questions implied by the elements of the definition of dialogue.

The definition of the ideal dialogue is that "serious address and response between two or more persons in which the being and truth of

each is confronted by the being and truth of the other" (Howe, 1963, p. 4). Thus, the elements of dialogue through written discourse are the physically present participant, be it freshman reader or author; an unseen participant or participants, be it an author of a text read or an audience written to; and the entire text, be it a book or manuscript, by means of which the interaction occurs.

From the three elements of this definition are derived three heuristical questions expressed from the point of view of the freshman reader or writer:

1. Which present participant wants to gain by reading or to give by writing what insight?
2. Which unseen participant wants to give by writing or gain by reading what insight?
3. By which means of written discourse, such as a series of ideational questions and answers in a text, is this insight conveyed appropriately?

Seemingly simple, these questions are full of implictions. The first question asks who the present freshman reader or writer is, that is, what that person's personality or voice is; asks what his or her purpose is; and, most important, seeks the insight he or she wishes to gain or give. The second question asks about the absent participant or participants and their needs and insights. The third question asks what the means of written discourse are, such as a series of ideational questions and answers, appeals to emotions through figures of speech, and sense-appealing words. This heuristical set of questions has the capacity to help generate invention, is flexible enough to be varied to suit many situations, and is foundational enough to transcend disciplinary lines, meeting DeBlois' (1980) requirements for transferability.

Instructors may center the course on this definition and the implied questions not only by stating them verbatim but also by presenting them in various forms, at various times, at all stages of the processes, and for both reading and writing, acting by plan or by serendipitous accident. An appropriate time for direct expression occurs during the introduction to the course when freshmen can give examples of various types of non-verbal and verbal dialogue. At the beginning of one or more class periods, the instructor can ask for a few moments of quiet so that freshmen can consider the question "Why are we here?" Particularly successful are the office conferences scheduled before freshmen write compositions when the instructor assists invention by asking these questions: "In one sentence, what do you want most to say?"; "Who needs to know?"; and "By what steps can you reach your readers?" Equally successful have been conferences, usually in laboratory situations after freshmen have written a composition, when the instructor assists editing by posing the same questions in the past tense. Instructors can write various forms of the three questions on the board to serve as guides for peer editing. And the semester can conclude with a final dialogical review of these questions.

Since reading is re-creative and and writing is creative, the three dialogical questions are re-phrased for reading and for writing. Three sub-activities for emphasizing the dialogical nature of reading and three for writing will be described. These questions and sub-activities clearly involve interaction among participants in the dialogue and are to be applied recursively.

First Sub-Activity for Dialogical Reading: Present Participants' Asking an Opening Question

The first dialogical question focusing on reading is this:

1. Which present freshman reader wants to gain insight concerning what?

The main sub-activity early in reading the essay is showing the freshman reader how to ask an opening question regarding the author's main insight. The freshman reader looks at his or her own genuine question or purpose or voice, seeking truth. He or she also looks at the orignally intended readers and their questions; important clues to the identity of these readers are the essay's date, place of publication, and publisher. Mainly, the instructor demonstrates how to ask an appropriate opening question, one that will eventually lead to an underlying central answer or insight. The instructor models the process by reading aloud the title and introductory paragraph or paragraphs of an essay, pointing out the question he or she asks and later showing the stated or implied answer that eventually is given. The instructor can read a professional essay as well as a good student composition, using the same procedure. These opening questions will go beyond the narrative questions, such as "What will happen next?" and descriptive questions, such as "What is the difference between A and B?" to the explanatory questions, such as "What is the significance of the difference between A and B?" and "By looking at A and B, what is discovered?" (see Appendix A for examples of different types of questions expressed in general terms). A real example of an opening question may also be helpful. When Mark Twain states in "Two Views of the River" (1883/1981) "But I [as an experienced river pilot] had lost something, too," a reader might ask, "What had you

lost that you [as an apprentice] once had?" Freshman readers will find it helpful to jot their opening question in the margin and to underline the author's stated answer in colored ink. Descriptions of pre-reading, such as the description by Trimmer and Hairston (1981, pp. 5-10), provide useful suggestions for carrying out this sub-activity.

Second Sub-Activity for Dialogical Reading: Hearing the Voice of the Unseen Author

The second dialogical question focusing on reading is this:

2. Which unseen author wants to give what insight?

Usually, the author's personality and his or her insight are closely related. The reader will want to know where the author is coming from, that is, the author's ethos, credibility, and voice. External clues that suggest the author's voice or personality are biographical information available in the text or library, including such facts as age, sex, profession, and philosophy. The author's voice may be, for example, scholarly, scientific, or business-like. The internal clues that suggest the author's attitude are kinds of vocabulary, figures of speech, sounds of words and rhythms, and other linguistic elements. The author's attitude or tone may be, for example, enthusiastic, patronizing, or fearful. The instructor models the process of discovering the voice and attitude, reads aloud accordingly, later calls on several freshmen to read aloud, and urges all class members to practice hearing the voices and attitudes of all authors whom they read. Freshmen find it helpful to underscore key words and phrases and to make notes in the margins.

Third Sub-Activity for Dialogical Reading. Marking a Series of Sub-Questions and Sub-Answers

The third dialogical question focusing on reading is this:

3. By which means of written discourse, such as a series of sub-questions and sub-answers, is the opening question answered clearly and pleasingly?

Although all aspects of the "word" or logo are means of communication, the major emphasis in freshman English is placed on discovering the overall organization of an essay, not entirely excluding attention to paragraphs, complex sentences, and new vocabularies. Usually the reader's opening question leads to the author's sub-answer, which leads to the reader's next sub-question in a process which continues until the author's final answer is stated or implied. This series of interlocking questions and answers provides coherence, with any cohesion that is needed coming from specific transitional devices, such as transitional phrases. For example, if the author has answered the reader's opening question, "What is the meaning of the difference between A and B?" by stating "A is superior to B in three ways," the reader's first sub-question might be "How is A better than B in even one particular way?" An instructor models the process or provides freshmen with the opportunity to discover it themselves. For example, the instructor may read aloud the body of an essay which students in the class do not have a copy of and, at appropriate points, ask for sub-questions. If the author has written well and the readers are keen, the author's sub-answers appear amazingly soon and lead to readers' new sub-questions. Freshmen may be urged to jot sub-questions in margins and underscore sub-answers in color. Silent or oral readings should capture the pregnant pauses between reader's sub-questions and writer's sub-answers and imply the flow of dialogue.

Mapping, that is, diagramming the flow of thoughts and facts between general and specific, described by Sternglass (1983, p. 67), is a useful addition to this sub-activity.

All three questions for dialogical reading may be combined and clarified by role-playing, one person being a reader and another person being the author. This activity may be called peer reading.

First Sub-Activity for Dialogical Writing: Discovering an Answer-Insight Through Discussion

The writing process is creative and thus lends itself to a special form of the three dialogical questions and somewhat special sub-activities.

The first dialogical question focusing on writing is this:

1. Which present freshman writer wants to give what answer-insight? Or, in one sentence, what do you want to say most?

Although some time may be spent on the students' discovering who they are and considering their own purposes, the main focus rests on the students' discovering or inventing central insights to present to readers. Freshmen writers can become aware of who they are and of their voices by observing their learning modes or temperaments, barriers, special abilities, and other qualities of personality, enabling them to establish ethos and credibility. They may examine their attitudes, such as cautious or overly confident. Freshmen writers can become aware of different purposes within the range of expository purposes. Freshmen can make these discoveries by comparing themselves with other freshmen writers, such as those in Writer's Work, 2nd ed. (Memering & O'Hare, 1984); by oral readings; and by writing for different expository purposes.

The main sub-activity is helping students to discover an insight into or the significance of a group of facts through generative class

discussion which leads to students' suggestions of topics. Since instructors frequently focus a one-week or two-week lesson on a particular pattern of exposition, such as comparison and contrast, discussion may begin with readings of that type, first on the instructional level and then on the independent level suitable for models. The instructor notes the difference between an essay that merely describes contrast between two entities and one that presents the significance of the contrast between the entities, making a point. Then the instructor can take a subject appropriate for contrast, such as food for two local restaurants; choose an audience of readers, such as college students in a new city wanting to secure healthy food on a budget; and model the process of reaching a central insight by jotting down facts in two columns, grouping these facts according to relevant criteria, placing the grouped facts in parallel rows, and observing these groups to synthesize the content and discover an insight. The significance of the difference, or insight, in the example may be of many general forms: that one restaurant is superior, that both restasurants are inferior, that both restaurants are superior, or that other conclusions must be drawn. A simple specific discovery or conclusion answer might be "Since the food at Restaurant A is factory-style in several ways and the food at Restaurant B is home-made in several ways, Restaurant B has the more wholesome food for college students." During this modeling, freshmen have participated, and a meaningful point has been created. After the general assignment is made and clarified, the generative class discussion continues. The instructor suggests several subjects involving contrast to find discoveries about and asks the freshmen to suggest additional subjects. Frequently one subject that a student

mentions leads spontaneously to other subjects until everyone, or nearly everyone, feels assured that he or she can find significance concerning one item that is now on the official list. Although there are numerous additional activities for invention, such as transcendental meditation (Pearson, 1983); imaging (McQueen, 1983); Aristotle's (L. Cooper, 1932) topoi; Burke's (1969) pentad; the five journalistic questions (Grassi and DeBlois, 1984, p. 28); Flower and Hayes' (1980) problem-solving techniques; Burns' (1983) computerized exercises; Pike's (1965) tagmemics of particle, wave, and field; and Hillock's (1983) inquiry method, this generative class discussion is appropriately dialogical and is open to any additional approaches.

Second Sub-Activity for Dialogical Writing: Addressing Unseen Readers

The second dialogical question focusing on writing is this:

2. Which unseen readers need to know this insight?

Writers must address their readers by opening statements that show respect, arouse interest, inform, and imply a plan for the remaining dialogue. Writers can describe their assigned or selected readers and consider the readers' needs, sexes, present knowledge, ages, temperaments or learning modes, barriers, socio-economic classes, and any other relevant factors. The readers' voices may be those of a group of seniors at the freshmen's former high schools, their own parents, or instructors of their classes. After hearing their readers' questioning voices, freshman writers try to address them in appropriate roles and tones. Freshman writers become aware of the pathos or the good of the readers. The major instructional sub-activity is demonstrating ways to address the particular readers so as to interest them enough to ask appropriate opening questions.

After reading and discussing various types of introductions, the instructor can place an introduction or a sentence outline directed to one group of readers, such as fellow university students, on the blackboard and ask what changes need to be made to direct it to another group, such as parents of university students. This sub-activity, which like all other sub-activities is used recursively often leads to a writer's seeing his or her insight from a new point of view, checking it for its truth, and modifying his or her own views.

Third Sub-Activity for Dialogical Writing: Planning a Series of Sub-Answers and Sub-Questions

The third dialogical question focused on writing is this:

3. By which means of written discourse such as a series of sub-questions and sub-answers, can the answer-insight be conveyed clearly and pleasingly?

Although all aspects of the "word" or logos are means of conveying insight, the major emphasis in freshman English falls on structuring supporting points of an essay in dialogical order, thereby assuring coherence. Thus, a simple form of this question is "By what steps can you reach your readers?"

Usually the writer's opening statement leads to a reader's opening question which leads to a writer's sub-answer, and so forth. The series of sub-answers and sub-questions is associated with the particular type of exposition being carried out. For example, if the reader's opening question is "By looking at A and B, what insight is developed?" and involves contrast, the first sub-answer might be "Since Restaurant A has food that contains fillers and perservatives but Restaurant B has food made from organic ingredients, Restaurant B

is more home-like in respect to the nutritional value of its food"; the readers, still unsatisfied, are likely to ask the next sub-question, "What can one learn by comparing the food on some other basis, such as the way it is cooked?" Instructors can model the process of working out a series of answers and questions for entire essays. Instructors can demonstrate how to arrange the series in dialogical order, such as chronological, spatial, or climactic. They can demonstrate how to place a pattern-for-dialogue sentence, such as "There are three important differences between A and B," near the end of the introduction to guide readers in the question-asking process. When the students write the first draft of their essays, they may jot the readers's sub-question in the margin before proceeding to the next sub-answer.

All three questions for dialogical writing may be combined and clarified by role-playing and by filling out what Ching (1983, p. 10) calls a "planning sheet." Role-playing can help students recognize whether their papers are monological, demogogical, or genuinely dialogical. The planning sheet lists items that should be considered, each item followed by a colon and space for writing information helpful in answering the three dialogical questions for writing. First the sheet requests information on the writer: role, personality, or voice; attitude, mood, or impression; purpose; and central insight. The sheet requests facts on the readers: identities; the occasion, time, and place of publication; and the type of publication. It also requests the type of explanation and the order of presenting the series of sub-questions and sub-answers for reaching readers.

Activities for Developmentally Sequencing Learning Opportunities for Freshman Communicators Using Written Discourse

Some freshmen become anxious concerning writing because they are poorly prepared or because some authorities expect them to accomplish in one semester objectives well beyond their natural psycholinguistic development. Although instructors usually cannot change standards for passsing the course, instructors can begin at an elementary level of each aspect of the course and then increase the expectations gradually during the semester.

The research in Chapter II states that activities should help freshmen develop as authentic question-asking and question-answering persons who are communicating through written discourse, and research provides five specific bases for designing instructional activities. In developing as authentic persons, freshmen can benefit from activities which give them opportunities to move to higher life stages. In developing as authentic persons who communicate through written discourse, freshmen can benefit from reading at a higher level than the level at which they are writing. In developing as authentic beginning-academic writers, freshmen need increasingly difficult challenges in the three dialogical questions: as active participants, they need to strengthen their voices, purposes, and insights; in order to address their readers, they need increased awareness of various groups of people; and to improve their ability to ask and answer questions, they need increased skill in expository tools for thinking along with skills in correctly and effectively using sentences and words.

Before a semester begins, instructors can plan the sequence of increasingly greater opportunities and challenges, expecting to make adjustments as the semester progresses and as individual differences appear. Here will be suggested a sequencing in three degrees of difficulty, each degree lasting approximately four weeks during the semester. First, plans for sequencing activities in each of the five just-named areas of development are presented. Then these activities will be re-stated in terms of what is appropriate for each of the three four-week periods and will form a general plan for increasing expectations during the semester.

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Intellectual and Ethical Stages of Life: Instructor Leadership to Student Self-Direction

A person's stage-of-life of intellectual and ethical or value-system development helps determine how the person learns best and, therefore, is taught best. It is recommended by Chickering (1981, Spring, p. 23) that to give students opportunities for advancing to a higher stage, instructors pitch their activities one stage above than the student's current stage. To give freshmen opportunities to move from being in the stage of self-protection (Weathersby, 1981, p. 58) or dualism (W. G. Perry, Jr., 1981) to the stage of conformity or multiplicity and on to the stage of conscientiousness or relativism, instructors can sequence their teaching from instructor-led discussions; to learner-centered discussion and peer activities; and on to self-undertaken activities, such as programmed learning or self-evaluation.

This sequencing may be carried out during the body of the class hours and at other times as well. Volunteers for writing on the blackboard early in the semester may be the most confident persons, later be less confident ones, and finally be the least confident. Peer editing may be done first with a chosen friend or acquaintance, later with an assigned and similar person, and finally with a quite different person. Conferences with the instructor may be at first non-threatening ones to get to know each other, later be required ones for outline reviews, and finally be optional ones. Marking freshman papers may at first provide a full rule in the margin for the most serious one-third of the problems in syntax and diction, later provide only the general rule number for the most serious two-thirds of the problems, and finally provide only a check in the margin for all problems, the idea of using progressively less specific marks coming from Black (1982). Most important, credit for the achievements can be weighted so that the best one of the first four short compositions plus the improvement in reading samples counts one-eighth, the better of the next two counts two-eighths, the next one counts one-eighth, the next one counts two-eighths, and the final examination on some of the readings counts two-eighths.

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Written Discourse: Using Appropriate Reading As a Precursor for Writing

Reading, a largely re-creative activity, is a precursor for writing, a largely creative activity, at all points in the semester. To help students learn to read, instructors will provide students with essays at what Bormuth (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 578) calls the "instructional level" for each type of written discourse covered in

the semester. To help students read these essays, the three dialogical reading questions previously described can be used. To facilitate enrichment of reading skills and arts introduced to students earlier and to serve as models for freshman writing, instructors will also provide essays at the "independent level." Some published collections available contain essays at both levels; otherwise, instructors may find examples of essays at the independent level in a rhetoric or may copy examples to hand out. In the following discussion of sequencing, it is assumed that readings of all types of essays, at both levels, and of increasing difficulty at each level will be given to students.

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth As Active Participants in Dialogical Writing: Informal to Simple-Academic Voices, Purposes, and Insights

Since the first dialogical question for writing is "Which present freshman writer wants to give what insight?" instructors will want to help students grow in who they are, that is voice; in what they want to accomplish, that is, purpose; and especially in insights discovered.

An instructor helps freshmen grow in awareness of their voices by sequencing assignments from relatively free and informal voices to more academic voices to simple-academic voices. The relatively free and informal voices may be illustrated by the often witty and fun-loving freshman essays in Writer's Work, 2nd ed. (Memering and O'Hare, 1984). The more academic voices eliminate the second person, you; make inconspicious the first person, I and we; and emphasize the third person, he, she, it, and they. The simple-academic voice is

that used typically for short reports in other freshman courses and requires semi-formal English.

An instructor helps freshmen grow in purpose by helping them become aware first of the differing purposes of narration, description, exposition, and argument. Then the instructor develops awareness of differing expository purposes, such as analyzing a process or classifying persons, places, or things.

An instructor helps freshmen grow in insights by sequencing the topics for writing according to students' ages, that is their positions in the biological life cycle. The early topics may concern managing time for classes, work, and recreation and becoming less dependent on their families. The next subjects may concern managing peer relationships and managing new university "homes." The last subjects for writing may deal with choosing life-work and solving problems of the immediate community. Some readings as well as optional topics for writing may go beyond these subjects to engagement, marriage, and having a family.

These activities for increasing difficulty in the first dialogical question move from relatively informal voices, purposes, and insights to more objective ones and then to more active ones.

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Awareness of Unseen Participants in the Dialogue: Peers to Negative Adults

In planning the semester's activities, an instructor can sequence opportunities to aid freshman writers to become aware of increasingly distant unseen participants in the dialogue. Early compositions may be written to university peers who ask questions, the answering essays therefore beginning with clear topic sentences. Later compositions

may be written to instructors of other courses that the freshmen are taking and to other important adults who need to become interested in what the freshman writes, a strong introduction being required in these compositions. Later compositions may be addressed to other adults who are somewhat negative to the positions freshmen take, these essays requiring a strong appeal to the good will of the readers and conclusions that "imprint" (Osborn, 1976, p. 22) the main point on the readers' minds.

Developmentally Sequencing Opportunities for Growth in Such Means of Dialogue As Types of Series of Answers and Questions: Exposition by Narrative to Simple Argument

In planning the semester, instructors can sequence opportunities for student growth in ability to ask and answer increasingly more difficult types of questions in the expository essays and the argument. During the first four weeks, instructors can show four basic types of elementary answers and questions. Instructors model how to explain a stated point by means of narration, descriptive details, several examples, and definition extended by examples. These short compositions of more than 150 words may be written in class from a one-sentence plan prepared in advance, and each composition may use types of questions and answers that students learned in the preceding week or weeks.

During the middle four weeks, instructors can show two types of series of questions and answers. First, instructors model how to explain a point by questions and answers implying comparison and contrast, using either two or three supporting points; then instructors model how to explain a point by several types of

classifications, forming three main supporting points or paragraphs that contain any or all of the five types of questions and answers learned earlier. These activities should result in short essays of more than 350 words written in class from a sentence outline prepared in advance.

During the last four weeks, instructors can show two types of analysis, causal and process, and one simple type of argument. Instructors first model how to explain a point by analyzing one effect's causes and one cause's effects and secondly model how to explain a point by analyzing a process into a cause which leads to an effect which becomes a cause for an effect. The instructor then models a series of questions and answers for argument. All types of series of questions and answers learned in the two preceding four-week periods are used in this problem-cause-solution argument. To answer "What is the problem?" writers can use narratives, descriptive details, examples, and definitions as inductive evidence of the problem; to answer "What is the cause?" writers use comparison, contrast, classification, cause-effect analysis, and process analysis; once deductive reasoning leads to the question "What can be done?" writers can give an answer and explain how to achieve the action by process analysis. These activities of this last four-week period should result in full-length essays of more than 500 words written from a detailed sentence outline or a rough draft in or outside of class.

In planning the semester, instructors also sequence opportunities for student growth in asking and answering questions expressed in increasingly more complex sentences and worded in increasingly richer

vocabulary. Instructors focus first on correctness and clarity, then on effectiveness, and finally on strength. During the first four weeks on correctness of sentences, instructors review completeness of sentences; sound punctuation of developing parts of sentences; and the correct fitting together of parts of sentences, such as predicates with subjects and pronouns with antecedents. During the next four weeks on effectiveness of sentences, instructors introduce ways to combine short sentences into more effective sentences, for instance, by changing unsound compound sentences into complex ones, measuring on the average approximately eleven words per independent clause. In the last four weeks, instructors may introduce strengthening sentences through balance, parallelism, and climax, change of predicates into prepositional phrases, and formation of absolute phrases; the resulting sentences might average twelve and a half words per independent clause. During the first four weeks on correctness of words, instructors review accuracy of denotation, standard spelling, and avoidance of slang. During the next four weeks on effectivness of words, instructors introduce connotation of words, enlargement of vocabulary, and moderate formality of words. During the last four weeks on strengthening words, instructors suggest use of figures of speech, enrichment of vocabulary, and beginning-academic formality. During the twelve weeks, freshmen should reduce the total number of errors in syntax and diction from twelve errors per hundred words to eight or fewer.

General Plan for a Semester

Plans have been presented for sequencing the important opportunities for growth in five areas: life stage, reading, writing

as initiating participants, writing with readers in mind, and writing using various capacities of language. These plans will now be summarized in terms of what can best be covered in the three four-week periods. The first four weeks can include use of instructor leadership; appropriate types of reading which precurse types of writing; writing with somewhat informal voices, purposes, and insights; writing to new peers; and writing short compositions on expository questions explained by narration, descriptive details, examples, and definition, all expressed in correct sentences and correct words. The second four weeks can include use of learner-centered and peer-centered instruction; appropriate types of reading which precurse types of writing; writing with somewhat academic voices, purposes, and insights; writing to instructors in other courses and sympathetic adults; and writing short essays on expository questions explained by comparison and contrast and classification, all expressed in effective sentences and effective words. The last four weeks can include use of student self-direction; appropriate types of reading which percurse types of writing; writing with beginning-academic voices, purposes, and insights; writing to uninterested or negative adults; and writing full-length essays on expository questions explained by causal analysis, process analysis, and simple argument, expressed in strong sentences and strong words.

Activities for Practicing the Seven Steps in the Processes of Freshman Co munication Through Written Discourse

Freshmen may learn how to read or write only superfically because some planners limit time for teaching so much that pressured

instructors may over-emphasize an imitative or product-oriented approach. Although unlikely to circumvent the inadequacy of time entirely, instructors can recognize the needed steps in the processes of dialogical "address and response" (Howe, 1963, p. 37) in written form and can focus on those processes as much as possible through instructional activities. It is assumed that instructors already know instructional activities for using models and for describing the products of written dis urse.

One instructional activity for developing each of the seven pairs of steps in the processes of reading and writing will be described. For each step, the activity for either reading or writing will be described fully, the remaining activity being indicated briefly. The seven steps are focused, broad, close, intensive, evaluative, public, and wide and free dialoguing. Since the steps in the processes of both reading and writing are recursive, the activities must be used recursively. It will be noticed that all three dialogical questions are involved in carrying out each of the seven pairs of steps and that the seven pairs of steps are used for each type of written discourse and hence during each lesson of the semester. After the seven pairs of activities are presented, a two-week lesson will be outlined which contains the activities and which serves as a model that can be varied for eight other lessons during the semester.

Activity for Focused Dialoguing: Using a Dialogical Microcosmic Question or Answer

To focus on the center of a dialogue, the discourser uses a microcosmic sentence. A microcosmic sentence of a piece of written discourse is formed of the main thought, supporting points and facts,

and means and order of presentation. A microcosmic sentence summarizes an entire essay, or cosmos, into a nutshell, or microcosm. This sentence includes the traditional thesis sentence, which expresses a main thought, and adds the other elements, resulting in a fairly long and complex but coherent sentence. This sentence, which is challenging to write, emphasizes the main thought or truth by placing it in the independent clause; subordinates the supporting, experienceable points and facts by placing them into lesser clauses or words; and implies the pattern of explanation and the order of the supporting points through phrasing. It should be stated in language suitable to the active and the unseen participants. This sentence may well appear at the beginning of a sentence outline. In the declarative mood used by a writer, the sentence may be called a microcosmic answer. In an interrogative mood used by a reader, the sentence may be called a microcosmic question.

Instructors can make available to students various patterns for microcosmic sentences for each of the nine types of essays usually taught lesson by lesson as the semester progresses (see Appendix A). Students may place sentences from reading or for writing on the blackboard. The main thought may be underscored twice; the supporting points may be underscored once; and arrows may be drawn from the main point to the supporting points, which are stated so as to be clearly relevant to the main thought and which are presented in proper order. Although this sentence must be clear and coherent, since it is usually long and complex, freshmen will need to debine it when writing the actual paper, possibly placing the subject of the main thought in the

introduction, the supporting points in the body, and the predicate of the main thought in the conclusion.

Activity for Broad Dialoguing: Using Dialogical Sentence-Outlining of Sub-Questions and Sub-Answers

An activity for broad dialoguing is demonstrating how to use a series of sub-questions and sub-answers to form dialogical sentence outlines of written discourse. Sometimes students discover this series of sub-questions and sub-answers early in the process of reading and writing and then work towards stating a microcosmic sentence. For example, freshmen readers can pencil their own questions in the margin of an essay as they begin to form an outline. They may highlight the author's answers, then paraphrase them, and finally use them for the Roman numeralled statements in their sentence outlines. Freshman writers can write their answers in the body of a sentence outline, draw arrows to relevant words in the microcosmic sentence, and pencil what they assume to be their readers' questions in the margin. Instructors can ask readers and writers to place dialogical outlines on the blackboard during the ten minutes before class begins. When these outlines are reviewed during class, the instructor and students are challenged to spontaneous and educational dialogue.

Two added suggestions might be made. The Roman-numeraled sentences for each supporting point may be carried word-for-word into appropriate paragraphs of the paper as introductions, mid-statements, or conclusions. Alternatively, these sentences may be broken into the subject, from which to form an introductory topic sentence for the paragraph, and a predicate, useful in forming a concluding sentence

for the paragraph. The first method results in clarity of expression, the second in effectiveness.

Activity for Close Dialoguing: Dialogical Sentence-Debining and Sentence-Combining

An activity for close dialoguing is sentence-combining, which is extremely well known, a good bibliography being provided by Kerek, Daiker, and Morenberg (1980). Very simply, sentence-combining involves taking several brief sentences and forming them into one more succinct, complex, and forceful sentence by making the larger elements, such as independent clauses, into smaller units, such as dependent clauses, or by embedding elements, for example, turning predicates into participles or other types of adjectives. Although sentence-combining is often practiced on textbook exercises with students' forming and discussing a large variety of possible resultant sentences, dialogical sentence-combining goes further. Dialogical sentence-combining requires considering the voice, purpose, and insights of the writer; the needs of the readers; and the appropriate pattern of explanation, such as contrast. Once freshmen have settled their views on these dialogical matters, they enjoy the challenge of shaping excellent sentences orally by discussing material shown on an overhead projector or by writing several versions on the blackboard. Further, groups of related sentences or "chunks," as Memering and O'Hare (1984, p. 305) call them, may be combined into paragraphs.

Sentence-debining involves taking one long complex sentence and re-forming the brief sentences of which it is made. This activity is less-studied than sentence-combining although Freeman (1981) states that a writer's overly long and complex sentence may be deconstructed. Unlike diagramming sentences into parts of speech, sentence-debining

resolves a longer sentence into full-fledged, shorter sentences, enabling readers to clarify and simplify the meaning. Sentence-combining and sentence-debining may be suggested whenever individual students need them and are writing correctly enough and after these activities have been introduced to an entire class.

Activity for Intensive Dialoguing: Dialogical Observation of Exactly What Is There

Like each of the three earlier-described activities which focus strongly on one level of written discourse, the essay, the paragraph, and the sentence respectively, the activity for this step focuses on one level of discourse. This activity emphasizes those elements smaller than sentences, that is figures of speech, sounds of words, connotations and denotations of words, spelling, and formality of diction. This activity requires students to observe exactly what is there in the written discourse.

The readers who have already carried out earlier steps in reading and discovered what Thomas and Brown call the "plain sense" (1941, p. 744) or the literal meaning can then observe exactly and re-create all figures of speech so as to experience the author's moods. They then read the passage aloud in that mood, notice what sounds seem "an echo to the sense" (Pope, 1711/1959, p. 764), and gain an intense understanding of the meaning.

The writers who have already written drafts of a composition can observe exactly what is there when they edit and proofread. First the instructor models the oral reading of capitals, punctuation, and spelling in exercises in the handbook. Then students can try to pronounce commas, periods, and semicolons for the class as a whole; if punctuation is inappropriate, for example in incomplete sentences, the

oral results cause laughter. Students also enjoy reading exactly what is there in sentences containing dangling modifiers, misplaced modifiers, or inadequate punctuation when they realize what the writer said instead of what he or she intended to say. They can now observe exactly what is there in their own compositions, eliciting praise and some changes. A two-part method may be needed. First students may be encouraged to observe exactly what is there in each sentence in a composition, reading from the last sentence to the first one. Then they may observe exactly what is there in each word taken from the last word to the first. These lesser-than-sentence elements can be made stronger by improving word choice, adding figures of speech, and emphasizing appropriate sounds, producing a clear sub-structure.

Activity for Evaluative Dialoguing: Dialogical Reviews by Helpful Others

While the four preceding steps in dialoguing by reading and writing have occurred largely within the freshmen, the next recursive step opens the written discourse to an evaluation by helpful others, such as peers and the instructor. An activity called peer editing, which was studied and described thoroughly by Bruffee (1980) and many others, allows student-writers to exchange drafts of their compositions and to offer praise and suggestions to each other. An instructor may provide a variety of bases for peer editing of the compositions during the semester, for instance, sometimes using questions based on Plato's truth, goodness, and beauty and sometimes using questions based on Aristotle's unity, variety, and arrangement. Rating rubrics can be provided to students, or rubrics may be formed cooperatively (Winterowd, 1981) with or without evaluative points allotted to

various of the requirements. One such rubric may have rows marked essay, paragraph, sentence, and word; columns may be headed unifying truth, sound development, and suitable means; and the twelve squares may be filled in with appropriate requirements. When instructors review students' compositions, they dialogue, making praiseful responses in the margins of the papers, using dialogically phrased standards, and making perceptive and dialogically phrased terminal suggestions. This dialogical review by helpful others is completed only when the help given by others is selectively taken by the writers to revise papers substantially and to prepare papers neatly for the next step in the process.

Peer editing may be applied to reading when helpful others listen to oral versions of essays. Students may listen to each others' readings possibly in small groups during class. Instructors may occasionally listen to oral reading during office conferences.

Activity for Public Dialoguing: Sharing and Publication

Dialogue is not an exercise involving only an "address" but is a living encounter begging for a "response" (Howe, 1963, p. 4). In a university English class, dialogue begs for at least a minimal "response." To share what has been read, the oral readings of essays thought best by small groups or the instructor may be presented to the whole class. Traditional class discussions of essays at the instructional level facilitate sharing and help embed meanings and methods into students' minds.

To share what has been written, the instructor may read aloud anonymously several excellent, varied student compositions. The rewritten versions of papers may be peer read. The better papers may

be placed in a class notebook or put on reserve in the library for all to read, pages being provided for response by readers. The best papers may be entered in essay contests. Some papers may be sent to the actual addressees, such as newspaper editors. All papers may be preserved in folders. In any case, active response to the content of the papers is important.

Activity for Wide and Free Dialoguing: Reading and Writing Journals

Both reading and writing journals can enrich freshmen's arts and skills, give opportunities for freedom of choice in impression and expression, and increase fluency. A manila folder with a pocket on the inside of each cover can hold on the left, loose pages of a reading journal and on the right, loose pages of a writing journal. The instructor can point out that these journals are personal, neither as intimate as diaries nor as objective as science reports, and that these journals should be made for the person's own benefit, present and future. In the reading journal, freshmen might include summaries or interpretations of non-assigned readings and might copy or paraphrase favorite passages. In the writing journals, freshmen might include thoughts and discoveries which they wish to preserve and questions they would like answered. The instructors' charge is to read parts of the journals at the end of each four-weeks' period, to suggest to freshmen how to benefit from this activity in future reading or writing, to make brief erasible comments, and to record the completion of at least a minimum number of words in the record book.

Plan for a Two-Week Lesson

A typical lesson during the middle of the semester lasts two weeks. The following lesson covers reading and writing expositions

developed by means of contrast. The first day of a Tuesday-Thursday class would include commenting on the results of the previous lesson's reading and writing; reading two essays developed by contrast, one essay written by a professional writer and one written by a student in a previous semester; forming microcosmic sentences for each essay to serve as patterns for the next reading and writing; deciding topics; making appointments for conferences on outlines; and finding volunteers to write sentence outlines on the board just before the next class meeting. The Thursday class would include closer readings of the essays for sub-questions, specifically those used for subject-by-subject arrangement and topic-by-topic arrangement; intense oral reading; a review of the outlines on the board; and some attention to effective sentences and words. The second Tuesday class would include a role-playing session with one student reading his rough draft to see whether the introduction will elicit an appropriate opening question from his intended audience; sentence-debining and sentence-combining; and "reading what's there" in handbook exercises. The second Thursday is reserved for students' bringing an outline of an essay read independently; for writing under examination conditions from a partial sentence outline the composition developed by comparison and contrast; for peer editing according to a set of questions more complex than those of an earlier lesson; and for the instructor's reading the journals. The beginning of the following Tuesday will be devoted to reading aloud one outline on the independent reading and an original written composition so as to share them, to evaluate them, and to be enriched by them.

Activities for Interrelating Reading and Writing and Thus Laying Foundations for Transfer Between Them and to Other Disciplines

Freshman skills and arts in reading and writing are not always strong and flexible enough to transfer between reading and writing, into future reading or writing, and into other disciplines partly because opportunities for transfer are limited when reading and writing are taught separately. However, instructors who understand potential methods and results of transfer of learning, even though they cannot entirely alter the separation of reading and writing or have enough time for adequate instruction in reading, can seek the potential benefit of transferability. A major benefit, based on heuristics that have generative capacity, flexibility, and transcendency (DeBlois, 1980), is true literacy (Johnson, 1984) which leads to freedom. In addition to giving attention to transfer, instructors will give regular and required assignments in reading and writing and, it is assumed, will know instructional activities for doing so.

First, instructors can demonstrate visibly the strength of dialogical communication in general during class meetings and conferences. Secondly, an instructor can allow students opportunities to discover the relationships between re-creative and creative written discourse for themselves by juxtaposing reading and writing. Thirdly, instructors can use a strengthening exercise that leads freshmen communicators from reading to writing and back to reading again. Finally an instructor can suggest ways to use reading and writing to enable students to increase their learning of concepts and the clarity of concepts learned in other disciplines.

Demonstrating the Strength of Dialogical Communication in General

This activity of demonstrating the strength of dialogical communications in general is to make the classroom and office into places that exemplify the strengths of dialogue, especially the capacity of dialogue to form community. At the beginning of the semester all freshmen, when their names are called from an information form they have just filled out, introduce themselves briefly, and mention anticipated careers, hobbies, jobs, birth places, or other identifying facts; the instructor likewise introduces himself or herself. This activity results in fun and enlightenment. Before the first class period is over, freshmen are urged to secure two or three names and telephone numbers of peers so as to be able to get assignments and notes in case of absences; friendships begin here. During the semester at the beginning of a number of class sessions, instructors ask students for a moment of silence to remember why they are there, as solemnity and seriousness reign. Class discussions themselves are dialogues; for example, an instructor can ask students for any questions or comments they have about an assigned reading; the responses become opening questions which lead from sub-answers to sub-questions and to a final answer. At the conclusion of the semester, the last five minutes can be given to everyone's farewells, such as something gained from the course, a plan for the future, a simple goodbye; these are always moments of fulfillment. This dialogue can spread to the office conference, to the dormitory, to the rest of the campus, and to the home. The classroom dialogue encourages additional outcomes and demonstrates transfer.

Providing Freshmen Opportunities to Discover the Relationships Between Reading and Writing

Freshmen are likely to comprehend to some extent the relationships, both similarities and differences, between reading and writing through activities described earlier. The similarities can also be implied by juxtaposing reading and writing without comment. The instructor might place a microcosmic sentence from a reading on one blackboard and a microcosmic sentence for writing on the next board. A handout on the seven steps of reading may be followed later by a handout on the seven steps of writing. The pattern of a question on an essay examination may be shown to suggest the pattern for an answer. Short sentences debined from a complex sentence may be, without the original sentence's being visible, combined into a similar or a new sentence.

Differences between reading and writing too may be implied. Freshmen discover that reading is re-creative and writing is creative at all steps: readers ask opening questions, but writers provide answers; readers have a series of sub-questions, but writers have a series of sub-answers; readers analyze complex setences, but writers build complex sentences; readers seek exactly what is there, but writers put exactly what there is; readers admire and judge, but writers judge and admire; readers "unpublish," but writers publish; and readers continue reading, but writers continue writing. What is important is that freshmen who clearly see relations between reading and writing are likely to be encouraged to see relationships in other areas and to gain corresponding benefits.

Providing an Exercise for Experiencing the Strength That Comes from Interrelating Reading and Writing

An exercise for experiencing the strength that comes from interrelating reading and writing takes the form of written sheets of instructions with spaces for brief answers and a longer paragraph. One such exercise provides a short student-written argument of the problem-cause-solution type on the subject of smoking; the exercise asks at least one question for the first five steps in reading, requiring description of the author, paraphrasing, sentence outlining, and so forth as helps to reading. Then students are asked to re-write substantially one of the three body paragraphs but only after describing their own voice and insight and the new readers' needs. At this point, before the student puts pen to paper, occurs a remarkable feeling of strength. The instructions continue with the next three steps in writing. They end with suggestions for related readings in the essay text or elsewhere. A variation of this procedure is to begin with reading an essay, ask for writing on the same subject, and then comment on student papers by suggesting new readings. Another variation is to use the reading journals to suggest future writings and to use writing journals to suggest future readings.

Suggesting Ways to Transfer Dialogical Communication Through Reading and Writing to Other Disciplines

This activity is simply to suggest to freshmen times and places and ways to transfer their experiences in dialogical communication through written discourse to other disciplines. At mid-semester time, an instructor can hand out sample essay questions along with good and poor answers, discussing effectiveness. When an instructor introduces

each new pattern of exposition, he or she can point out uses for this pattern in other disciplines, for example, cause-effect analysis being important in history and process analysis being invaluable in chemistry. When freshmen have assignments in other disciplines, such as reviewing books, plays, or concerts, an instructor can point out useful patterns. If students feel that they will not need to write in certain careers, they may be asked to interview a person in their chosen fields and report results to the class. When reading and writing across the curriculum occurs, innumerable other possibilities for transferability exist.

Summary

Surely these instructional activities are sufficient to form a full set. First instructors center the course on a definition of dialogue and on three implied questions to be used whenever students read or write. Then instructors sequence opportunities for learning skills and arts developmentally into three four-week periods, moving from informal to academic. Instructors model seven activities for carrying out the seven pairs of actions whenever students read or write, including forming a microcosmic sentence, preparing a dialogical sentence outline, practicing sentence-combining and sentence-debining, observing exactly what is there, obtaining helpful peer review, sharing resultant oral readings and written compositions, and keeping reading and writing journals. To facilitate transfer between reading and writing and beyond them, instructors demonstrate dialogue in general, present reading and writing in juxtaposition, provide a strengthening exercise, and suggest further transfer.

It is recommended that before a semester begins, these activities be placed in a matrix on a very large sheet of paper. The first column of the matrix lists downward the eight one-week lessons chronologically. The second column suggests the dialogical questions expressed in various terms at various times. The third column lists the degree of difficulty of opportunities for growth to be provided for each four-week period. The next seven columns list the suggestions for each of the seven steps. The last column lists ways to achieve transfer. Each row for the eight lessons is divided into a sub-row for reading and a sub-row for writing. The appropriate instructional activities are filled into each square.

This tentative plan is not a binding contract. The activities are available as an instructor deems appropriate. However, this set of activities in written form is comforting when an instructor has completed commenting on fifty or a hundred freshman compositions late in the week-end and needs to prepare for an early Monday morning class.

This set of instructional activities has been demonstrated in a closely observed way with results reported in the next chapter. In the final chapter any needed refinements will be discussed.

Chapter IV

EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES IN AN OBSERVED DEMONSTRATION: DESCRIPTION, OBSERVATIONAL METHODS, AND RESULTS

Three earlier chapters have presented the need for a coherent set of instructional activities, the literature-based criteria for developing such a set of activities, and the description of the set of activities developed. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the evaluation of this set of instructional activities through a six-instrument observation of a one-semester demonstration. By means of the outcomes of the observations of this formative demonstration, it is possible, in the final chapter, to summarize which activities seem to be working and what refinement of activities or instruments is advisable.

The actual demonstration of the set of activities was preceded by a pilot study which gave directions for the demonstration. The pilot study, though incomplete in several ways, gave opportunity to use the entire set of activities; to prepare handouts; to set up and try out the instruments; to practice scoring the tests; and to interview all freshmen in the class to learn their explanations for particular successes or failures. The demonstration incorporated important improvements suggested by the pilot study, occurred in a class more typical in number and abilities of students, and gave unobstructed

opportunity to observe and to evaluate the set of instructional activities as a whole.

First the pilot study is reported in four parts: a description of the program of the semester, a full description of the observational instruments along with the method for analyzing the resulting data, an evaluation of the activities on the basis of the data, and a statement of new directions for the demonstration.

Then the demonstration is reported in four parts: a full description of the semester's activities, an explanation of alterations in the instruments, a thorough evaluation of each of the four types of instructional activities, and a summary of major findings.

Pilot Study

The pilot study is described in detail because it is similar to the demonstration in program, instruments and data analysis, and evaluation of instructional activities. This description permits noting differences in students' preparations and in some results. The description contains three parts and a statement of directions for refinements.

Description of the Setting, Students, and Instructional Program for the Pilot Study

The pilot study was done at a large urban state university which has a number of doctoral programs. The study occurred in a required one-semester, three credit-hour, standard freshman English course. To enter the course, students needed either a score of 19 or better in ACT-English, a score of 450 on the SAT-verbal, a rank of 4 or better on their writing sample evaluated by the standards of the City

University of New York (CUNY Task Force, 1979), or a C or better in a previously taken developmental course. In order to provide for internal and external validity of the study, advisors agreed to assign at random to one section mostly freshmen taking the course as their first univeristy English course. However, the plan failed when students in this category simply did not register during the spring semester of the study; the section was filled with twenty-five students less typical of university freshmen.

The characteristics of the 16 students who completed the semester were these: mean score in ACT-English of 15.7; mean age of 22.0 years; 10 males and 6 females; 14 full-time and 2 part-time students; mean high school grade-point-average of 2.46; mean hours worked weekly 17.7; and mean absences 3.1 (see Table 1). Of these students, 4 were repeating the standard course, 8 had taken the preceding developmental course, and only 4 were taking the course as their first university English course. These students had a wide range of characteristics: scores in ACT-English from 6 to 23; ages from 18 to 48; high school grade-point-averages from 1.4 to 3.2; and hours worked from 0 to 35. Such a wide variation tends to make teaching each and every student difficult. The other 9 students who did not complete the semester and their scores in ACT-English are these: 1 who never attended, 11; 1 who withdrew from the university, 14; 1 who became ill after registering, none on record; 3 athletes who did not return after spring break, 11, 13, and 16; 2 repeating the standard course, 10 and 20; and 1 who left probably to take a job, 19. The scores in ACT-English were not learned until the last week and could not influence the instructional activities.

Table 1

Pilot Study: Demographics of the Freshmen Who Completed the Course

	ACT-English	Age	High School GPA	Hours Worked Weekly	Absences
Means	15.7	22.0	2.46	17.7	3.1
S. Dev.	5.6	7.5	.58	12.5	2.2
Ranges	6-23	18-48	1.4-3.2	0-35	0-8
Number	14	15	14	15	15

Entering Status		Sex		Student Status		Course Grade	
Repeating standard course	4	Male	10	Full-time	14	A	4
		Female	6	Part-time	2	B	0
						C	7
Took developmental course	8					D	4
						F	1
First-time in course	4						

The instruction occurred during a class which met on Tuesday and Thursday mornings for an hour and fifteen minutes in a clean, sunny room. The syllabus used met all the requirements of the English department and was almost identical with the syllabus described in "Tentative Schedule of Readings and Writings" for the demonstration (see Appendix B). However, although these students were encouraged to see the importance of reading for its own sake and for its contribution to their learning to write, no direct credit was given for reading. The instructional activities described in Chapter III were used with slight emphases expected in adjusting to the particular freshmen in

the section as follows. The activity for achieving dialogue was used with some special emphasis on correctness. The activities for sequencing were used. All activities for the seven steps in the processes of reading and writing were employed, although the handout on the seven steps of reading was presented only after mid-semester and although some students made so many errors in short sentences that they were not pressed to use sentence-combining extensively. The strengthening exercise for transfer of skills between reading and writing was handed out only as an optional activity.

Texts were chosen from the English department's list but were used selectively as means of carrying out the instructional activities for goals, sequencing, processes, and outcomes described in Chapter III. The collection of essays, Trimmer and Hairston's The Riverside Reader (1981), included essays written in nine different patterns with a range of difficulty within each pattern. The textbook for rhetoric, Memering and O'Hare's Writer's Work, 2nd ed. (1984), contained descriptions of and informal student-written examples of most patterns. The handbook, Hodges and Whitten's Harbrace College Handbook, 9th ed. (1982), contained numbered rules on correct ways of writing sentences and words along with some exercises. This investigator was the instructor and, as a full-time, ranked, tenured faculty member with twenty years of experience, taught the course as part of a full teaching load.

Methods of Observing the Instructional Activities in the Pilot Study: Instruments and Data Analysis

It was essential to observe the set of activities as a whole and to observe the activities in each of the four categories, categories

patterned after those of Stufflebeam (1970/1973): goals, input, process, and product. However no one instrument or set of instruments designed for this purpose was available. Thus it was decided to use a variety of available instruments, analyze the data gained through these instruments, place the results of the analyses into appropriate categories of instructional activities, and then evaluate each of the four types of instructional activities and the set of activities as a whole as to helpfulness.

The six instruments chosen along with the appropriate methods of analyzing the data gathered through them follow. The first two instruments are quantitative, the next two are qualitative, and the last two are both quantitative and qualitative.

The Questionnaire on Instructional Activities and the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS)

Two generally quantitative instruments were used to observe the freshmen's perceptions of their experiences: a questionnaire on instructional activities and the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS, 1980). The questionnaire on instructional activities (see Appendix C) was designed and written by this researcher to discover the students' perceptions of various instructional activities in this study. One question concerned dialogue, fourteen questions covered activities for the seven paired steps in the processes of reading and of writing, and two short-answer questions dealt with the transfer from reading to writing and from writing to reading. These questions made it possible to contribute to the evaluation of three of the four types of instructional activities. Except for the two short-answer questions, the questionnaire used a Likert scale with 1 for "very

helpful"; 2 for "helpful"; 3 for "sometimes helpful, sometimes not"; 4 for "not helpful"; and 5 for "a hindrance." This questionnaire was administered on the final day and, when completed, was delivered in a sealed envelope by two freshmen to a university official who kept the envelope until after grades were turned in.

This questionnaire permitted reporting means and standard deviations for each Likert-scaled item. The questionnaire also permitted use of statistical techniques for various purposes. Since assumptions of normality of population and homogeneity of variance were met but assumptions of independence and randomization were not met, conclusions from these statistical procedures could be drawn only for these or similar students and circumstances. The questionnaire permitted use of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to compare students' perceptions of the helpfulness of the seven activities for carrying out the steps in the process of reading with the helpfulness of the seven activities for carrying out the steps in the process of writing. The null hypothesis that the mean vector for reading activities equaled the mean vector for writing activities was tested at the .05 level of significance. Later, when the null hypothesis was rejected in the demonstration, an interesting exploration of whether the activity for each step in reading was perceived as being as helpful as the activity for each corresponding step in writing was carried out by seven one-way analyses of variance, tested at the .05 level of significance.

Also, this questionnaire permitted use of a one-way analysis of variance to observe whether these freshmen perceived any one or more of the seven activities for steps in the process of reading as

differing in helpfulness from the other activities for steps in the process of reading. The null hypothesis that the means for the seven reading activities were equal to each other was tested at the .05 level of significance. When the null hypothesis was rejected, the differing step or steps were identified by a Tukey follow-up. A second one-way analysis of variance was used to observe students' perceptions of activities for writing.

The Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS, 1980), a course-instructor evaluation instrument provided by the university, contained certain questions judged appropriate to observing and evaluating instructional activities for developmental sequencing and was administered along with the questionnaire on instructional activities. The instrument was Likert-scaled for "strongly agree" (1), "agree" (2), "neutral" (3), "disagree" (4), and "strongly disagree" (5). The SIRS also permitted calculating means and standard deviations on the responses that indicated students' perceptions of the course.

The Student Interviews and the Instructor's Journal

Two largely qualitative instruments were used, the interviews of students and the instructor's journal. The interviews of all sixteen freshmen in the class, conducted after the final examination, were perhaps the best way to determine whether each student was helped with his or her particular problem by means of the instructional activities used. A question planned for each student began the interview, for instance, "How did you raise your grade from a D+ to an A-?" or "What could have been done to improve your spelling?" After the first question, a free flow of exchange occurred.

The instructor's journal recorded notes that this instructor-researcher made while correcting the compositions that the freshmen had written, while preparing for classes, and after completing classes. Results of both instruments were analyzed by content analysis and contributed to evaluating all four types of instructional activities.

Cloze Reading Samples Supplemented by the Goodman Miscue Analysis

To facilitate observation of skills and arts demonstrated in products of reading, three cloze reading samples were used, supplemented by Goodman miscue analysis of several samples. This procedure enabled obtaining an overall quantitative score along with a qualitative review of individual successes or problems, methods appropriate in a formative pilot study. The cloze reading samples were designed by Bormuth (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 584) and are rated as valid (Rankin, 1974). To make a cloze reading sample, the researcher selects a grade-level passage of approximately 250 words, deletes every fifth word after the first sentence, substitutes a blank line, and instructs students to fill in the blanks without a time limit. Scoring is done by giving two points for correct closure of each of the fifty blanks, not counting misspellings and synonyms. Bormuth states that students who score between 58 and 100 are reading the passage at an independent level, students who score 44 to 57 are reading at an instructional level, and students who score 43 or less are reading at a frustrational level.

It was decided to use twelfth-grade-level passages for these beginning college freshmen. The passages were taken from the Science

Research Associates (SRA) Reading Laboratory--College Prep Edition, IVa (1959) tan rate builders on single cards marked 12. Parker, author of the instructor's manual, states:

> Each selection has been either selected or adapted to fit the needs of a particular color level to which it was assigned in respect to length, level of abstraction, and reading difficulty. For the latter, the SRA Reading Ease Calculator formula was used. . . . In addition, each selection was field-tested in actual classrooms in both the United States and Canada for interest value and for the validity of the exercises. (p. 6)

The three twelfth-grade-level passages herein used were chosen from 20 passages at that level because they contained patterns of exposition usually taught by the middle of the first semester, that is, comparison-contrast, definition, and classification. The passages were then randomly given in this order: the 12th selection, adapted from "Jobs in Science" (see Appendix D); the 9th selection, adapted from F. Russell's "A Journal of the Plague: the 1918 Influenza Epidemic" (SRA, 1959); and the 19th selection, adapted from Mario Pei's Language for Everyone (see Appendix D).

The cloze reading samples permitted analysis of the scores in terms of the number of freshmen reading at the independent, instructional, and frustrational levels. The reading samples also permitted use of analysis of variance and covariance with repeated measures (one-within) using ACT-English as covariate to determine whether significant improvement occurred. The null hypothesis was that reading was no better at the end of the course than at the beginning, tested at the .05 level of significance. The analysis was applied by a BMDP computer program.

The Goodman miscue analyses were carried out on several students' cloze reading samples as a qualitative means of providing information

on the students' achievements in reading levels. Goodman (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, pp. 582-83) outlined the procedure. The analyst records all changes from the original wording, categorizes these changes according to an eight-point taxonomy called the Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI), gives a possible interpretation of the cause for each miscue, and decides what action to take to resolve any problem a reader may have. Such an analysis can give information as to which cuing systems are working, whether reading errors are similar to writing errors, and whether teaching writing might help reading in various ways. In sum, both quantitative and qualitative observations of the students' achieved skills and arts demonstrated in the products of reading were possible.

Buxton-Scored Writing Samples

To facilitate observation of skills and arts demonstrated in the products of writing, Buxton-scored writing samples were used. Writing samples are valid measures of writing arts and skills. To score writing samples for experimental purposes, Buxton (1958) designed a 300-point scale. He could obtain a total score, a score for the category of rhetorical effectiveness, and a score for number of errors, along with scores for numerous sub-categories. The category of rehetorical effectiveness covers four sub-categories: material, further subdivided into significance, evidence of critical thinking, and originality; organization, further subdivided into title, introduction, logical sequence of paragraphs, unity within paragraphs, transitions between paragraphs, general coherence, and effective conclusion; sentences, further subdivided into variety in sentence structure and general fluency; and diction, further subdivided into

exactness and vividness of words and interest and appropriateness of figures of speech. The category of correctness of words and sentences covers six sub-categories: spelling, punctuation, usage, grammar, sentences, and form. The error rate is calculated by dividing the number of errors by the number of words in a sample and multiplying by 1000. The overall raw score is calculated by awarding 75 points, adding the total of the four rhetorical categories for two readers and dividing by 2, and subtracting the error rate. The scaled score is the raw score divided by 3, making the scaled scores run from 1 to 100. Buxton's rating sheet was revised only to make it easier for the scorers to use (see Appendix E).

Instructions for writing samples were designed to observe all three skills often taught at the middle of the semester, that is, definition, comparison-contrast, and classification (see Appendix F). The topics concerned maturity, television, and the relationship between college and jobs. Topics were judged equally difficult by three experienced assistant professors. The topics were randomly assigned for pre-test, mid-test, and post-test, with maturity first and the relationship between college and jobs last. Instructions and topics were photocopied and given to students one class period in advance so as to permit time for the students to think, plan, and make a few notes at the bottom of the instruction sheet. Approximately fifty minutes were allowed for students to write short compositions on the topics.

The scoring of all writing samples was done by two mature, members of the English department's teaching faculty who held master's degrees in English. The scoring took place at a large table that

facilitated independent work and in a home setting which permitted lunch and coffee breaks to offset possible fatigue during three six-hour days. Rating sheets (see Appendix E) and all materials were provided. Although this investigator marked errors in advance with small hatch marks in the margins, ample opportunity for readers to agree or disagree was given. Compositions were otherwise unmarked and were unidentified. In order to simplify readers' comparing qualities of writing, all papers on one topic were given during one day of scoring. The randomly chosen order was post-test, pre-test, and mid-test. Orientation was carried out daily by practicing on two papers not a part of this study, the goal being to agree on the scoring system or rules, if not on the final scores; also after every fifth paper had been scored, a comparison was made of the ratings for every category and of the reason for any differences; improvements and clarifications were made gradually as scoring progressed, following Buxton's procedure. For example, it was decided that the subdivision on originality of material would be reserved for reader-oriented rhetorical devices broader than one sentence, such as anticlimax, and that the subdivision on diction would be reserved for rhetorical effectiveness of a sentence or word. It was decided that since these students were given instructions and time for writing only a short composition whereas Buxton's students wrote a full-length essay, coherence between paragraphs would be broadened to include coherence between "chunks" (Memering & O'Hare, 1984, p. 305), or groups of sentences within paragraphs. The general position was to give as much credit as possible for rhetorical effectiveness and to deduct as much as possible for errors, in short, to do a thorough reading. In order

to observe inter-rater reliability, correlations between the ratings that scorers assigned to each of the topics were calculated.

These writing samples permitted use of analysis of variance with repeated measures (one-within) to determine whether various aspects of writing improved. The null hypothesis was that the aspects of writing were not better at the end of the course than at the beginning, tested at the .05 level of significance. The analysis of variance with repeated measures was applied similarly to the overall score, the category of rhetorical effectiveness, the category of errors per thousand words, and the number of errors. Thus both wholistic and analytical observations of the skills and arts demonstrated in the products of writing were possible.

Evaluation of the Instructional Activities and of the Instruments in the Pilot Study

Although not all the demographics of the students in the pilot study were typical of those of freshmen at this university, this pilot study gave direction as to which instructional activities and instruments were likely to be useful in the demonstration. After the data gathered by the six observational instruments was put into four categories, each of the four types of instructional activities was evaluated.

Dialogical Communication Along with Course Goals

The activity for emphasizing the rhetorical nature of communication through written discourse without disregarding correctness is centering the course on the definition of dialogue, a definition which implies three dialogical questions for reading and three for writing. This activity was evaluated by responses students made to the first question on the questionnaire on activities, by

relevant responses during student interviews, and by relevant entries in the instructor's journal. The students' perceptions of course goals were evaluated by relevant questions on the SIRS; and a frequently set course goal, correctness of writing, was measured by the average number of errors reduced in writing a thousand words.

Question A of the questionnaire on instructional activities specifically addresses the value of reviewing the concept of dialogue. The Likert scale ran from one for "very helpful" to five for "a hindrance." On the average, these students found the activity helpful, giving a mean response of 2.00 (see Table 2).

Table 2

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of the Activity for Centering the Course on Dialogue and of the Measures of the Goals of the Course

		Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Activity for Centering the Course on Dialogue				2.00
Question A of Questionnaire on Activities:	Review of the idea of dialogue and the three basic questions....	2.00	.76	
Goals of the Course				2.02
SIRS-17	The instructor appeared to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner.	1.93	.80	
SIRS-20	The direction of the course was adequately outlined.	2.07	1.03	
SIRS-24	The stated course objectives were reflected in the exams.	2.07	.70	

N=15

Two student comments support the helpfulness of reviewing dialogue: "Writing different papers helped me write different types of dialogue" and "Both books [The Riverside Reader and Writer's Work] helped me understand why the essays that were assigned were written (inner body understanding)." The instructor's journal of February 28th refers to review of the concept of dialogue as part of "one of the best classes." On that day, several compositions read aloud sounded excellent to the students despite the fact that the compositions contained numerous errors in punctuation and spelling. When students objected to the low grade given such compositions, this instructor told about the lives of Plato and Aristotle in fable form, explaining that each had three standards for judging a piece of rhetoric; Plato judged on truth, goodness for others, and beauty; and Aristotle judged on unity, development or topoi, and suitability of arrangement. Then came the game of deciding which set of standards was better and which composition should be graded higher, the one full of thought but unclearly stated or the one clearly stated but empty of thought. The students decided that good dialogue requires both thought and clarity. Still, they found misspelling a minor barrier to dialogue. So, a volunteer was asked to "take a paper, any paper" from a set of recently annotated but unidentified compositions; this time punctuations and spellings were read as they appeared on the composition, arousing much confusion, laughter, and recognition, even by the never-to-be-identified author himself.

On the average, the freshmen perceived, according to questions 17, 20, and 24 on SIRS, that the goals of the course in general were helpful, as indicated by an overall mean of 2.02 (see Table 2). Also

students reduced lexical, grammatical, and syntactic errors from 86 errors per thousand words to 81 errors per thousand words.

In summary, the observations of this activity of centering the course on dialogical communication while improving correctness indicated that this activity was evaluated as helpful, since the mean was 2.00, and that it was likely to be useful in the demonstration.

Developmental Sequencing Along with Course Demands

The instructional planning activities for sequencing included increasing opportunities for self-initiative, using reading as a precursor for writing, and moving gradually towards dialogues that were more academic in regard to the active participant, unseen participant, and means of written communication between participants. These activities for sequencing were designed to parallel natural psycholinguistic growth, although they might not be adequate to overcome unalterable pressures from outside in the form of inadequate preparation of students or unreasonable standards for completion of the course.

The activities for developmental sequencing were evaluated by two relevant Likert-scaled questions on SIRS and by interviews of the students. On the average, these students' perceptions of the activities for developmental sequencing, as the perceptions were expressed on SIRS 18 and 19, were that they were helpful, the mean being 2.03 (see Table 3). On interview, one freshman wrote that while an earlier experience in English was "pretty much a joke," this class was "well organized" and challenging. A student, who transferred in from another university and who was repeating the

Table 3

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Activities for Developmental Sequencing, of the Course Demands, and of All Aspects of the Course That Were Not Classified as Course Demands on the SIRS

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Developmental Sequencing			2.03
SIRS-18 The course was well organized.	2.13	1.19	
SIRS-19 The course materials appeared to be presented in logical content units.	1.93	.88	
Course Demands			3.32
SIRS-13 The instructor attempted to cover too much material.	3.07	1.39	
SIRS-14 The instructor generally presented the material too rapidly.	3.47	1.25	
SIRS-15 The homework assignments were too time-consuming relative to their contribution to your understanding of the course material.	3.00	1.31	
SIRS-16 You generally found coverage of topics in the assigned reading too difficult.	3.73	.88	
All Aspects of the Course That Were Not Classified as Course Demands on SIRS			1.84
SIRS 1-4 Instructor Involvement	1.50	.59	
SIRS 5-8 Student Interest	1.80	.71	
SIRS 9-12 Student-Instructor Interaction	1.82	.88	
SIRS 17-20 Course Organization	2.02	.96	
SIRS 21-26 Overall Evaluations	2.07	.95	

N=15

course due to illness, wrote in a comparison-and-contrast essay that this department of English in this university had "better course

presentation and overall atmosphere than its more prestigious counterpart."

The course was developmentally sequenced as a partial means of overcoming the problem of planner's overestimating students' psycholinguistic capabilities. Since the existing standards for grading the number and types of papers required in the course were maintained, it was interesting to observe how students perceived the demands of the course as indicated by the four questions that SIRS identified as course demands. Students expressed their perceptions of course demands, on a five-point Likert scale with three as "neutral" and four as "disagree," with a mean of 3.32. This rating indicates that students perceived course demands sometimes as reasonable but slightly more often as unreasonable. This mean of 3.32 was considerably lower than the mean of 2.03 for items directly relevant to the instructor's sequencing activities. Furthermore, this mean of 3.32 for course demands on the SIRS was far lower than the mean of 1.84 for all aspects of the course that were not classified as course demands by the SIRS.

In overestimating students' psycholinguistic capabilities, some planners tend to increase the working hours instructors must contribute to this course to help students meet requirements set for completing the course. A standard estimate for reading, marking, making suggestions on, and evaluating one freshman composition is 20 minutes of instructional time outside of class (Williams, 1985). The average time required weekly for 9 compositions during those 13 weeks of a semester spent on direct teaching of 25 students of average potential and preparation is 5.71 hours outside of class. According

to the instructor's journal, the average time required weekly for review of corrections on the original papers and for making suggestions on rewritten papers is .92 hours, giving a sub-total of 6.63 hours each week. When three hours of in-class instruction and three hours of preparation are added, giving a sub-total of 12.63 hours weekly, this sub-total must still be increased substantially to provide time for holding one or more required conferences with each student, keeping records, marking exercises, and carrying out other professional duties directly related to the course. Thus, on the average the instructor spends over twelve and one-half hours per week on this one course.

In summary, observations of the instructional activities for sequencing learning opportunities developmentally, despite some serious pressures from course demands, indicated that these instructional activities were evaluated as a helpful mean of 2.03 and were likely to be useful in the demonstration.

Processes of Communicating Through Reading and Writing Along with Course Instruction

There are seven instructional activities for helping freshmen communicate through the steps in the process of reading and seven activities for helping them communicate through the steps in the process of writing. Without an instructor's neglecting to describe the expected products of reading and writing, these fourteen activities explicitly addressed the processes of reading and writing texts, that is how to read and write. These instructional activities were evaluated by reports and analyses of students' responses on the fourteen relevant items on the questionnaire on activities, by students' statements during interviews, and by relevant information

from the instructor's journal. The instruction in the course in general was evaluated by eight items on the SIRS.

Students' perceptions of the helpfulness of the activities for each of the seven steps in reading and each of the seven steps in writing appeared in their responses to the questionnaire on activities, questions B to O. The item mean responses averaged, on a scale of one for "very helpful" to five for "a hindrance," for reading and writing combined a helpful 2.18 (see Table 4), for reading a helpful 2.23, and for writing a helpful 2.12.

Table 4

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Reading and Writing			2.18
Reading			2.23
1 Pre-reading, including asking the author an opening question and forming microcosmic sentences.	2.13	1.13	
2 Noticing how authors lead readers from question to question, for instance from problem to cause to solution.	1.80	.68	
3 Breaking down long complex sentences into short understandable sentences.	2.33	1.05	
4 Reading aloud essays from Riverside Reader or exercises from HCH to hear what is there.	2.43	.65	
5 Evaluating essays and compositions as might Plato (truth, concern for readers pleasingness) and Aristotle (unity of thought, development, orderliness).	1.93	.59	

Table 4 (Continued)

		Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
6	Discussing essays, such as "The Knife" and Twain's essay on the Mississippi, in class.	1.80	.94	
7	Keeping a journal on non-assigned readings.	3.21	.80	
Writing				2.12
1	Forming a mircocosmic sentence for one's own papers, sometimes using a pattern given in class.	1.80	1.01	
2	Forming "steps" in a sentence outline for one's own compositions, sometimes during office conferences.	1.67	.72	
3	Combining short sentences so as to emphasize the main point and subordinate lesser facts, as in 24b of HCH.	2.47	.74	
4	Peer-editing and self-editing compositions to read what is there.	2.07	.80	
5	Using all of the instructor's reactions to rewrite compositions.	1.87	.74	
6	Listening to other students' compositions read aloud in class and talking about their strengths.	2.13	.92	
7	Keeping a journal of free writing.	2.86	1.17	

N=15.

When the activities for reading were compared with the activities for writing, using the multivariate analysis of variance after tests for normality and homogeneity of variance had been passed, the null hypothesis of equality of mean vectors for reading and for writing activities could not be rejected, F (7,7) = 1.39, $p > .05$ (see Table 5). Thus, there was no indication that students' perceptions of the helpfulness of all activities for carrying out reading differed from

their perception of the helpfulness of all activities for carrying out writing. It followed that the activity for reading and the corresponding activity for writing at each step did not differ significantly. Accordingly no univariate analyses were needed or reported, although means are listed.

Table 5

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing by Means of Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Instructional Activity for Steps in Reading and Writing	Means		F	df	p
	Reading	Writing			
All Steps	2.21	2.11	1.39	7,7	.3361
1	2.07	1.86			
2	1.79	1.57			
3	2.36	2.43			
4	2.43	2.00			
5	1.86	1.86			
6	1.79	2.21			
7	3.21	2.86			

N=14.

In order to view whether any activity for a step in the process of reading was perceived as more helpful than any other activities in the process of reading, a one-way analysis of variance was used. Although the assumption of independence was not met, the assumptions of the normality of the population of scores and, according to the sphericity test, of homogeneity of variance, were met. The null

hypothesis that activities for all steps in the process of reading were equally helpful was rejected, F (6,78) = 6.24, $p < .0001$. Tukey follow-up procedures were used to identify the differing activity or activities (see Table 6). In reading, activities for steps 2, 6, 5, and 1 were perceived as more helpful than the activity for 7. Similarly, in order to view whether any activity for a step in writing was perceived as more helpful than any other activities in the process of writing, a one-way analysis of variance was used. The null hypothesis that activities for all steps in the process of writing were equally helpful was rejected, F (6,78) = 3.59, $p < .0034$. Tukey follow-up procedures identified the differing activity or activities. In writing, activities for 2, 1, and 5 were perceived as more helpful than the activity for 7. This instructor-researcher's review of the semester suggests that the freshmen rated as less helpful the somewhat less-used activities. However, the low rating for keeping of journals, the activity for step 7, has added explanations drawn from interviews. One student stated:

> I felt that keeping a journal was an enjoyable activity but at the end of the semester it became difficult to keep up with. Keeping a journal does help you realize your own creativity, but unless it is assigned as part of your grade, it really should be a voluntary act.

Another student stated, "I think reading other authors helps more than keeping a journal."

On interview, individual freshmen named activities for many steps in the processes of written discourse which explained their individual improvements. Regarding instructional activities for steps in reading, some reported that the "articles were wonderful" (step 5); that the greatest help was "reading aloud!" (4); that there was good "class

Table 6

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Reading and the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Writing by Two One-Way Analyses of Variance

Step of Reading Activity	Means for Perception of Reading Activity	F	df	p
2	1.79			
6	1.79			
5	1.86			
1	2.07			
3	2.36			
4	2.43			
7	3.21			
All steps for reading		6.24	6,78	.0001*
Tukey follow-up: 2,6,5, and 1 < 7.				

Step of Writing Activity	Means for Perception of Writing Activity	F	df	p
2	1.57			
1	1.86			
5	1.86			
4	2.00			
6	2.21			
3	2.43			
7	2.86			
All steps for writing		3.59	6,78	.0034*
Tukey follow-up: 2,1, and 5 < 7.				

*Statistically significant with $p < .05$.
N=14.

discussion" (6); that the "way we discussed reading in class" (1,2,3,6) helped us "get into it"; and that we "need everybody to read and discuss" (6). One student who was asked "How did you happen to

read and discuss 'The Surgeon's Knife' so well?" explained that he was interested in reading by his fifth-grade teacher, had been "under the knife" twice, and was "really awed" by the knife, which did not seem to be "cold steel." Regarding writing, some students reported that improvement came from "hours at home arranging outlines and rewriting" (1,2,5); "correcting papers as the most helpful class activity" (5); "taking a lot of time to think" (1,2); trying to "proofread more" (3,4); "using the rules in the HCH" to correct papers (5); "especially the red book [HCH]" (5); and "English 3200 [Blumenthal, 1972] helped, it really did!" (3,4,5).

The instructor's journal indicated that class meetings which were noted as "first rate" for instructional activities usually included activities for many steps in the processes of reading and writing. One such meeting occurred on February 21st. Papers revised and rewritten a week earlier were returned during the first five minutes so students could benefit from new comments (step 5). The instructor commented on papers written the preceding Thursday before returning those papers (1,2). Several good papers were read aloud and evaluated (5,6). The instructor explained that it was not necessary that every supporting point in an outline have only two supporting facts (2). After catching the attention of the students by saying that there was a principle too difficult for them to learn, the instructor demonstrated the principle that the supporting facts, such as contrasts, for one supporting point in an outline need not be of the same pattern as the supporting facts, such as illustrations, for another supporting point (2). The instructor explained that keeping a journal developed fluency (7). Dialogical editing charts were handed

out and reviewed (4,5). The meeting closed with a fun-session on exercises about who and whom in the handbook until everyone developed confidence (3,4) in using these abominable pronouns.

While processes of reading and writing were stressed, during course instruction, products sometimes were used as models; were described in terms of unity, development, and harmony; and were required to be completed as assigned. On the average, these freshmen's perceptions of course instruction, expressed on questions 3-6 and 9-10 on SIRS which had item means ranging from 1.40 to 1.93, were that course instruction was more than just helpful, with an overall mean of 1.75 (see Table 7).

Table 7

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Instruction in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS

		Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Perception of Instruction in the Course				1.75
SIRS-03	The instructor's use of examples or personal experiences helped get points across in class.	1.80	.56	
SIRS-04	The instructor seemed concerned with whether the students learned the material.	1.40	.63	
SIRS-05	You were interested in learning the course material.	1.93	.80	
SIRS-06	You were generally attentive in class.	1.[illegible]	.61	
SIRS-09	The instructor encouraged students to express opinions.	1.73	1.03	
SIRS-10	The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and others' viewpoints.	1.93	.96	

N=15

In summary, the observations of the instructional activities for helping freshmen use the seven recursive steps in the processes of reading and of writing without disregarding products indicated that the activities, including the least helpful activities of keeping ungraded journals, were evaluated as helpful, with a mean of 2.18, and were likely to be useful in the demonstration.

Transferability Along with Skills and Arts Shown in the Course's Products of Reading and Writing

Although the expected outcome of this course was improvement in skills and arts of both reading and writing as indicated by the cloze reading samples and the Buxton-scored writing samples, the special outcome that the instructional activities were designed to achieve was transferability. The instructional activities for transferability included demonstrating dialogical communication in the classroom setting, allowing freshmen to discover relationships between reading and writing, providing a strengthening exercise for interrelating reading and writing, and suggesting ways to transfer dialogical communication between reading and writing to other areas as well. The activities for emphasizing transfer were observed through Goodman miscue analysis, students' perceptions expressed on the questionnaire on instructional activities, and relevant statements made during interviews of students and in the instructor's journal.

The Goodman miscue analysis of cloze reading samples showed similarities between the students' miscues in reading and errors in writing, along with other similarities. For example, one student had trouble finding and holding the central thought throughout the reading of a pre-cloze passage just as he had problems of getting off the

subject in writing. He had difficulties recognizing levels of generality in both forms of written discourse. Also in reading, he used vocabulary, sentence structure, and phrases, that is, a total of 14 examples of numbers 5 and 6 of the Goodman taxonomy of miscues, indicating a dominance of oral language; he used similar types of non-standard English in writing. This student along with others needed to improve the quality and the quantity of reading, possibly bringing parallel improvement in writing.

In response to the first of two short-answer questions on the questionnaire on activities, all students wrote that reading helped them to write, most of them stating that reading helped considerably. Seven students explained that reading gave examples of effective and different ways to write, including patterns, structures, and organization. One explained that reading gave her "ideas to think about"; another said, "The different ways the authors were writing to their readers helped me to write papers with more care because I knew who I was writing to"; a third student indicated that the sentence-debining she learned while reading helped improve her writing; a final student wrote, "I steal words from other writers."

In response to the second short-answer question on the questionnaire on activities, fewer students wrote that writing helped reading, but their explanations for the help gained were illuminating. One student wrote that writing helps "to make the articles more interesting and understandable." A second student's statement seemed to the interviewer to add to the first student's statement:

> Writing essays made me read better because in writing sometimes my mind would go faster than my pen and I would have to slow down to read slowly what I had written . . . so I could punctuate

sentences correctly. Now I read slower and actually speak when I am reading, which helps my comprehension of a story or article.

Indications of broader transfer were recorded. "I believe this course will help me a great deal in every course I will take in the future." Other dialogical exchanges occurred during office conferences when students talked about the problem of remaining in the university, elaborate plans to study spelling, the need to go to a marriage counselor, or ways to make independent judgments. Students also expressed concern for the instructor in many ways.

Thus the instructional activities directed to transfer were fairly valuable although more attention might be given to transfer from writing to reading. The traditional activities of assigning nine essays to read and nine essays to write and the associated skills and arts that were revealed in the products will now be reported.

According to the cloze reading samples based on the specified passages and administered before, during, and after the course, these freshmen did not evidence improvement in the skills and arts in reading (see Table 8). After use of the sphericity test for homogeneity of variance, inspection of the scores for normality of distribution, adjustment through a covariate of ACT-English with a mean of 15.63, and use of the Greenhouse-Geiser adjustment for any lack of compound symmetry, the analysis of variance and covariance resulted in rejecting the null hypothesis that reading was no better at the end of the course than at the beginning. The adjusted means were 38.91, 42.91, and 28.00, with $\underline{F}$ (2,20) = 16.67, $\underline{p} < .0001$. A post hoc analysis without using ACT-English, a measure sometimes unreliable below 16, gave similar results, $\underline{F}$ (2,22) = 20.28, $\underline{p} < .0001$.

Table 8

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Achievements in Reading According to the Cloze Reading Samples and in Writing According to the Buxton-Scored Writing Samples

Test		Mean	S. Dev.	df	F	one-tail prob
Cloze Reading Samples with Covariate (N=11)	Pre-	38.91	9.05	2,20	16.67	.0001*
	Mid-	42.91	7.01			
	Post-	28.00	12.07			
Cloze Reading Samples Without Covariate (N=15,12,15)	Pre-	39.00	8.32	2,22	20.28	.0001*
	Mid-	42.83	6.68			
	Post-	27.83	10.93			
Tukey follow-up: Post-samples < pre-samples or mid-samples.						
Buxton-Scored Writing Samples Without Covariate (N=12)						
Overall Writing Score	Pre-	28.20	19.13	2,22	.44	.6478
	Mid-	26.92	17.31			
	Post-	32.34	16.26			
Rhetorical Effectiveness	Pre-	96.79	20.66	2,22	3.01	.0701
	Mid-	87.83	24.84			
	Post-	102.88	12.67			
Errors Per Thousand Words	Pre-	87.20	43.29	2,22	.10	.9086
	Mid-	82.07	27.14			
	Post-	80.86	40.70			
Number of Errors	Pre-	21.00	12.61	2,22	.05	.9490
	Mid-	19.83	10.13			
	Post-	20.33	8.91			

*Statistically significant with $p < .01$.

According to the Tukey follow-up, the post-samples were lower than either the pre-samples or the mid-samples, suggesting regression.

This seeming regression in students' achievements in reading must be viewed in the light of the results of the Goodman miscue analysis of a student's post-sample and the subsequent interview with the student who showed excellent achievement on other measures. Although her responses were frequently rated as imaginative and original on the Goodman taxonomy, the student made meaning changes, listed as number 7 on the Goodman taxonomy, that totaled 22. On interview, she stated that the passage (see Appendix D) was "difficult" and that after one particular sentence, everything "fell apart." It was learned that the blank that she had filled in with "educated" should have been filled in with an opposite word, "uncivilized." She added that there was "no chance to scratch out, go backwards, and change" even if she had known what her error was. The subject of the essay, linguisitics, was so unfamiliar that it created a testing problem for her and possibly for all other students. The instructor also recalled that during the semester, the students gradually realized that although they were encouraged to see the benefits of reading for its own sake and for improving writing, the final grade involved no direct credit for reading. Also it was recalled that the activities were planned for a more typical group of students. In summary, since testing needed improvement, it was difficult to determine whether activities were helpful enough; and therefore certainly testing and perhaps activities needed refinement.

According to the Buxton-scored writing samples based on the topics used and administered before, during, and after the course,

these freshmen showed improvement in all four aspects of writing measured (see Table 8). However, since the null hypothesis that writing was no better at the end than at the beginning could not be rejected, there was not evidence that the improvement was statistically significant. In overall writing score, students improved from a pre-sample mean of 28.20 to a post-sample mean of 32.34; this improvement was not statistically significant, F (2,22) = 0.44, $p > .05$. In rhetorical effectiveness, students improved from a pre-sample mean of 96.79 to a post-sample mean of 102.88; this improvement was not statistically significant, F (2,22) = 3.01, $p > .05$. In number of errors per thousand words, students improved from a mean of 87.20 to 82.07 to 80.86; this improvement was not statistically significant, F (2,22) = 0.10, $p > .05$. In number of errors, students improved slightly from a pre-sample mean of 21.00 to a post-sample mean of 20.33; this improvement was not statistically significant, F (2,22) = 0.05, $p > .05$.

However, the scoring of the writing samples and contents of interviews tended to suggest that improvements students made were not adequately measured. First, the inter-rater reliability on the rhetorical effectiveness of the post-samples, all read on the first day, was lowest, .5683 (N=16, $p < .011$); on the pre-samples, all read on the second day, was better, .8019 (N=16, $p < .001$); and on the mid-samples, all read on the third day, was best, .8292 (N=12, $p < .001$). The correlation for the overall writing score, which included rhetorical effectiveness and errors, was .9737 (N=12, $p < .001$). Therefore, there was indication that the readers gradually understood standards for rhetorical effectiveness and that papers scored earlier

were less reliably scored. The papers were not appropriately presented to readers in random order.

Second, interviews of three students attest to their having a sense of strong achievement in writing. One student said, "I really learned to write better." Another said, "At the beginning of this course, my first paper was D; due to the instructor's patience and interest, I am now capable of writing A and B papers." A third said:

> Today in English, I wrote a six-page paper, five of which were written during class. That's quite a change from when I first started. Last semester I couldn't even write one paragraph. I'm proud, to say the least.

The notations in the instructor's journal for March 17th showed recognition that these students would be helped by some alterations in activities for achievements especially in reading and to some extent in writing. Students could have profited from a handout on activities for each of the seven steps in the process of reading, from culminating tests and grades in reading, and from added assignments in reading given partially to help students see examples of correct writing rather than the errors in their own papers or in handbook exercises.

On the average, these students, according to four questions on the SIRS, perceived that they achieved helpful improvement in reading and writing, the mean being 2.17, and that they learned about 75% of the course material (see Table 9).

In summary, the observations suggested that those instructional activities for transfer were likely to be useful in the demonstration with some added attention to transfer from writing to reading. The observations of the students' achievements in reading and in writing suggested that refinement in testing was essential, that students

might not have been adequately prepared for the course, and that some improvement in activities might be needed.

Table 9

Pilot Study: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Their Achievements in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Freshmen Perceptions of Achievement			2.17
SIRS-08 You have become more competent in this area due to this course.	1.73	.70	
SIRS-21 This course made a significant contribution to your overall personal educational objectives.	2.20	.94	
SIRS-22 What percentage of the course material covered do you feel you actually learned? (1) more than 90%, (2) about 80%, (3) about 70%, (4) about 60%, and (5) less than 60%.	2.47	.99	
SIRS-23 The instructor adequately assessed how well students mastered the course objectives.	2.27	.70	

N=15

Major Instruments

Just as it was important to evaluate the instructional activities so was it important to evaluate the instruments. The two major instruments were especially well reviewed. The procedure of using the cloze reading samples and the Goodman miscue analysis, since it gave quantitative and qualitative observation, was judged advantageous. The cloze reading samples seemed adequate but had not been based on passages ranked approximately identical by SRA nor chosen for

likelihood that freshmen would be interested in and somewhat familiar with the content.

The Buxton-scored writing samples seemed adequate since they gave an overall score and also permitted calculating scores for sub-categories. However, samples were not presented randomly to the scorers who read them, so it was not possible on any given day to score some pre-samples, mid-samples, and post-samples, thus randomizing error. The standards for scoring papers become clear only gradually. Some categories which originally overlapped had been differentiated; some categories had to be judged on a point system for each example of a device; other categories had to be judged on an A to F basis. The readers found scoring by the Buxton scale illuminating, different from ordinary paper grading, and enjoyable.

The other four instruments were helpful, although interviews of students for observing the pilot study had not covered all four types of activities but instead each individual student's explanation of a problem or success.

Statement of New Directions for the Demonstration

Since the instructional activities were designed for typical freshmen in the standard first-semester English course, it was planned that students assigned to the demonstration be reasonably well prepared, that is, have scores in ACT-English of 19 or more and number at least 20. Random selection or stratified random sampling was planned to permit statistical inference to other groups of freshmen.

It was also planned to maintain instructional activities for both emphasizing the dialogical nature of communication and for developmental sequencing, since they were observed to be helpful.

It was planned to maintain the activities for teaching the steps in the processes of reading and writing, although the journals were to be made optional or to be graded. Efforts were planned to increase transfer from writing to reading. So that reading achievements might be strengthened, the handout on reading steps was to be provided early in the semester; and added weight for reading was to be given in the final grade. So that writing achievements might be strengthened, students who needed help with correctness of writing were to be advised to use English 3200 (Blumenthal, 1972) and other aids.

Instruments for observation of the demonstration needed refinement. Plans were made to select passages for the cloze reading tests that were of similar difficulty and covered reasonably familiar topics. Samples of writing to be scored by the Buxton method were to be presented to readers in completely randomized order. The interviews were to be expanded to include questions on all four sets of instructional activities. Whether or not to use mid-tests required balancing pros and cons. The statistical advantages of using repeated measures were the release from the requirement of independence of treatment by substituting compound symmetry and the increase in statistical power. The disadvantages of using repeated measures were that mid-tests took two class periods away from instruction and that such addded testing might hinder student-instructor interaction. Dropping the mid-sampling seemed preferable at this stage of development of the instructional activities. The covariate ACT-English seemed of no advantage and might be better omitted or run as a post hoc procedure.

Thus, the pilot study gave valuable directions for the demonstration. Description of the demonstration follows.

Demonstration

Description of the Setting, Students, and Instructional Program for the Demonstration

The demonstration was carried out in the same setting as the pilot study. In order that the freshmen for whom the instructional activities were designed be taught in the demonstration, the university's advising staff admitted 25 freshmen taking their first university English course to one section during a fall semester. All had scores in ACT-English of 19 or higher. Three other students entered by other avenues. The section had an enrollment of twenty-eight students whose characteristics were estimated typical of freshmen at that university and probably at other urban state universities.

The characteristics of the 24 students who completed the semester were these: mean score in ACT-English of 20.3 (N=21) and mean SCAT-Verbal of 65.3 (N=3); mean age of 19.4; 7 males and 17 females; all 24 in full-time programs; mean high school grade-point-averages of 3.18; mean hours worked weekly of 15.3; and mean absences of 1.4 (see Table 10). These freshmen had a narrow range of characteristics: scores in ACT-English from 13-25; ages from 17 to 28; and high school grade-point-averages from 1.90 to 3.83. Characteristics of the other four students on the roll and their entering scores were these: two who withdrew from the university, one with a SCAT-Verbal of 80 and the other with an ACT-English of 21; one with an ACT-English of 10

Table 10

Demonstration: Demographics of the Freshmen Who Completed the Course

	ACT-English	Age	High School GPA	Hours Worked Weekly	Absences
Means	20.3	19.4	3.18	15.3	1.4
S. Dev.	2.7	2.8	.42	13.0	1.6
Ranges	13-25	17-28	1.90-3.83	0-40	0-5

Entering Status		Sex		Student Status		Course Grade	
Repeating standard course	0	Male	7	Full-time	24	A	4
Took developmental course	0	Female	17	Part-time	0	B	13
First-time in course	24					C	7
						D	0
						F	0

N=21 for ACT-English: 13(1), 17(2), 19(3), 20(7), 21(2), 22(1), 23(2), 24(2), 25(1)
N=24 for all other demographics.

repeating the standard course and misenrolled; and one with an ACT-English of 21 who stopped attending. The scores in ACT-English were not learned until the last week and could not influence the instructor.

The instruction occurred on Tuesday and Thursday mornings in a clean and pleasant classsroom, met all the requirements of the English Department, and is described in "Tentative Schedule of Readings and Writings," a handout given freshmen class members on the first day (see Appendix B). Reading was given a definite though small role in the final grade for the course. One-eighth of the final grade was

calculated on the basis of the best of the five paragraphs averaged with the improvement in the scores on the two reading samples. Also one-fourth of the final grade was awarded on the basis of the final examination-essay which had topics that referred to essays read.

The four types of instructional activities in Chapter III were used with few modifications. The course was centered on dialogical communication without neglecting correctness. The activities for developmental sequencing were used without altering departmental standards for passing the course. All activities for teaching the seven recursive steps in the processes of reading and writing were carried out; the handout on steps in the process of reading was discussed early, some sentence-combining was taught, and the journals were made attractive, brief, optional, and check-marked in the grade book. The activities for developing transferability were put into practice even though the strengthening exercise on transfer between reading and writing was handed out only as an optional activity. Meanwhile, students were asked to read nine types of essays and to write nine compositions, not counting the final examination-essay.

The texts and the instructor were those described in the pilot study.

Methods of Observing the Instructional Activities in the Demonstration: Instruments and Data Analysis

The methods of observing the instructional activities in the demonstration were minor variations of the methods used in the pilot study. Two instruments remained unchanged. Four instruments were refined somewhat. The analysis of the data obtained through two instruments was slightly changed.

The Questionnaire on Instructional Activities and the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS)

The questionnaire on instructional activities was identical with that in the pilot study except for eliminating a typographical error. Identical statistical procedures compared students' perceptions of the relative helpfulness of activities for steps in reading with those activities for steps in writing, of each individual activity for reading with all other such activities, and of each individual activity for writing with all other activities. The Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS) was administered and analyzed as in the pilot study.

The Student Interviews and the Instructor's Journal

The interviews of students in the demonstration, rather than stressing the individual student's successes and needs as was done in the pilot study, were designed to gain these freshmen's perceptions of the entire range of instructional activities. Thorough interviews of five students were held four months after the end of the course and included identical direct questions on the helpfulness of each of the four types of activities along with questions on the greatest strengths and weaknesses of the activities in the course. As before, an instructor's journal was kept.

The Cloze Reading Samples Supplemented by the Goodman Miscue Analysis

The cloze reading tests were administered at the beginning and end of the course, using passages judged similar in difficulty and likely to be interesting to freshmen. The originally used 12th selection, adapted from "Jobs in Science," was used at the beginning

of the course and the newly used 14th selection, adapted from The Hidden Persuaders by Vance Packard (1957), was used at the end (see Appendix D). Instructions were clarified so that the freshmen knew that they could choose words appropriate to the original author, subject matter, and intended readers and that a hyphenated word could be used to fill in one blank. To test the null hypothesis that reading at the end of the course was no better than at the beginning, using the .05 level of significance, the scores were analyzed by the dependent t-test, as the assumptions of normality of distribution of the scores and homogeneity of variance were met, even though the lack of randomization limited interpretation of the outcomes to these or similar freshmen and circumstances. Goodman miscue analysis was applied to randomly selected freshmen's pre-samples and to the same freshmen's post-samples.

Buxton-Scored Writing Samples

The Buxton-scored writing samples were given as before, using two of the topics used earlier: first, the relationship of college education and opportunities for jobs and, second, the marks of maturity. When the compositions were read during the three days, the two scorers were given pre-samples and post-samples randomized. Standards developed by the end of the pilot study were used from the beginning of the scoring. To test the null hypothesis that the writing at the end of the course was no better than at the beginning, the dependent t-test was used for the overall writing scores, rhetorical effectiveness, errors per thousand words, and number of errors, after assumptions of normality of the population of scores and of homogeneity of variance had been met. So that the risk of failing

to reject a false null hypothesis due to reuse of data was minimized, the level of significance was reduced to .01.

Evaluation of the Instructional Activities and of the Instruments in the Demonstration

The evaluation of the instructional activities is presented in four categories: dialogical communication, developmental sequencing, processes in communicating through reading and writing, and transferability along with skills and arts shown in the products of reading and writing. Within each category, data is presented for evaluating the instructional activity. Information for evaluating a related aspect of the course follows. These related aspects are respectively these: course goals, course demands, course instruction, and course outcomes or skills and arts shown in the products of reading and writing. Afterwards, the instruments for observing the instructional activities are evaluated.

Dialogical Communication Along with Course Goals

The instructional activity for emphasizing the rhetorical nature of communication without disregarding correctness is centering the course on the definition of dialogue, a definition which implies three dialogical questions for reading and three questions for writing. This instructional activity was evaluated by responses to questions on the questionnaire and during interviews and by entries in the instructor's journal. Students' perceptions of course goals and their achievements in correctness of writing, a frequently emphasized course goal, were evaluated by relevant questions on SIRS and the number of errors reduced on writing samples.

Question A on the questionnaire on activities directly addressed the value of the review of the concept of dialogue. The Likert scale

ran from one for "very helpful" to five for "a hindrance." On the average, students found the activity helpful, giving a mean response of 1.83 (see Table 11). When the five students interviewed were asked whether the idea of dialogue was of any help to them in reading and writing, they gave the following responses: "A little"; "Yes, it made me want to express the truth"; "A lot! I could express myself and put down on paper how I feel"; "It made you stop and think about getting your meaning across . . . so you get your expression"; and "You had to go into deeper words [editor's underscoring] to get your ideas across." The instructor's journal of October 4 records the students' favorable reception to a way of combining the subjective standards of Plato and the objective standards of Aristotle by making an editing chart to review both. The instructor formed a matrix by using the elements of a composition to label the rows--essay-as-a-whole, paragraphs, sentences, and words--and by using the combined Aristotelian and Platonic standards to head the columns--unified truth, development shown in concern for readers, and orderly beauty--; then each square was filled with appropriate content.

In regard to the goals of the course, these freshmen perceived, according to three questions on SIRS, that the goals were helpfully clear, giving an overall mean of 2.28 (see Table 11). It must be noted that attention was given to correctness and that students reduced their lexical, grammatical, and syntactical errors from 89 per thousand words to 43.

In summary, this instructional activity of centering the course on dialogical communication, while substantially improving correctness, rated a more than helpful mean of 1.83 and seemed to be working.

Table 11

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of the Activity for Centering the Course on Dialogue and of the Measures of the Goals of the Course

		Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Activity for Centering Course on Dialogue				1.83
Question A of Questionnaire on Activities:	Review of the idea of dialogue and the three basic questions....	1.83	.57	
N=24				
Goals of the Course				2.28
SIRS-17	The instructor appeared to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner.	2.23	.53	
SIRS-20	The direction of the course was adequately outlined.	1.96	.49	
SIRS-24	The stated course objectives were reflected in the exams.	2.68	.78	
N=22				

Developmental Sequencing Along with Course Demands

The instructional activities for sequencing included increasing opportunities for self-initiative, using reading as a precursor for writing, and gradually moving towards dialogues that were more academic in regard to the active participant's thoughts, to the audiences, and to the means for communication between participants. These activities for sequencing were designed to parallel natural psycholinguistic growth, although they were not expected to overcome undue pressures of inadequate preparation of students or unreasonable standards for

completion of the course. The activities for sequencing and the course demands were evaluated separately.

The instructional activities for sequencing were evaluated on the basis of students' responses on the SIRS and during interviews as well as by statements in the instructor's journal. On the average, these students' perceptions of the sequencing activities, as expressed on SIRS 18 and 19, were that they were a helpful mean of 2.02 (see Table 12). When asked whether the order in which the students studied types of reading and writing was of any help, the freshmen interviewed responded: "Yes"; "We moved from our own experiences to someone else's ideas--I especially liked contrast"; and "each [type] built onto an erlier one. One student amplified: "Everything fell into line. Each built into the next one, and argument had them all. I liked the different ways and kinds of writing, the variety. It wasn't dull." In the instructor's journal was described the class period which revealed cumulative building in a persuasive argument of the problem-cause-solution type. The paragraph on the problem used inductive reasoning formed of expository narratives, descriptions, definitions, and examples. The paragraph on the cause used causal analysis studied in writing cause-effect papers. The paragraph on the solution, which was reached through enthymemic deductive reasoning, was developed by process analysis. The introductory paragraph had to appeal to the good will of the appropriate negative readers; and the conclusion had to "imprint" (Osborn, 1976, p. 22) the solution on the readers strongly enough to arouse them to action.

The course was developmentally sequenced as a partial means of alleviating the problem of the planners' overestimation of students'

Table 12

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Activities for Developmental Sequencing, of the Course Demands, and of All Aspects of the Course That Were Not Classified as Course Demands on the SIRS

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Developmental Sequencing			2.02
SIRS-18 The course was well organized.	1.96	.79	
SIRS-19 The course materials appeared to be presented in logical content units.	2.09	.61	
Course Demands			3.14
SIRS-13 The instructor attempted to cover too much material.	2.96	1.00	
SIRS-14 The instructor generally presented the material too rapidly.	2.86	.99	
SIRS-15 The homework assignments were too time-consuming relative to their contribution to your understanding of the course material.	3.18	1.05	
SIRS-16 You generally found coverage of topics in the assigned reading too difficult.	3.55	.86	
All Aspects of the Course That Were Not Classified as Course Demands on SIRS			2.08
SIRS 1-4 Instructor Involvement	1.93	.82	
SIRS 5-8 Student Interest	2.09	.82	
SIRS 9-12 Student-Instructor Interaction	2.15	.90	
SIRS 17-20 Course Organization	2.06	.61	
SIRS 21-26 Overall Evaluations	2.17	.89	

N=22

psychlinguistic capabilities. Since the department's standards for grading and number and type of papers and revisions were maintained,

it is interesting to observe that students' perceptions of the course demands contrasted sharply with their perceptions of the rest of the course. Freshmen responded to four questions that the SIRS identified as course demands. On a five-point scale with three as "neutral" and four as "disagree," they perceived course demands with a mean of 3.14 (see Table 12). This rating indicated that students perceived course demands as slightly unreasonable. Also, this mean of 3.14 was considerably lower than the mean of 2.02 for items directly relevant to the instructor's sequencing activities. Further, this mean of 3.14 for course demands was far lower than the mean of 2.08 for all aspects of the course that were not classified by the SIRS as course demands (see Table 12). An additional factor connected with the way students perceived course demands may be the time needed for student's jobs. These freshmen averaged 15.3 hours weekly for pay, 8 of them working from 20 to 40 hours.

When planners overestimate students' psycholinguistic capabilities, they tend to increase the working hours of those instructors who try to assist all students to reach the goals of the course. The instructor, according to standards described in the pilot study but applied to 28 students, was estimated to have contributed to reading, marking, making suggestions on, and evaluating compositions along with reviewing revised drafts 7.46 hours weekly. When 3 hours for in-class instruction and only 3 hours for class preparation are added, the sub-total is 13.46 hours weekly. These 13.46 hours do not yet include time for holding required conferences with students, marking reading or writing exercises, record-keeping, and carrying out other professional duties directly related to the

course. Thus, on the average, the instructor spends over thirteen and one-half hours per week on this one course.

In summary, observations of the instructional activities for sequencing the learning opportunities of the course developmentally indicated that, despite some serious pressures from other course demands, these activities rated a helpful 2.02 and seemed to be working well.

Processes of Communicating Through Reading and Writing Along with Course Instruction

There are seven instructional activities for helping freshmen communicate through the steps in the process of reading and a parallel seven activities for helping them communicate through the steps in the process of writing. Although products or results of what is read and written were described and used as models, these fourteen activities specifically addressed the processes of reading and writing, that is how to read and write. These activities were evaluated by reports and analyses of students' responses on the questionnaire on activities and during interviews along with relevant statements from the instructor's journal.

These freshmen's perceptions of the degree of helpfulness of the fourteen activities appeared in the responses to the questionnaire on instructional activities, Questions B to O. The responses averaged as a helpful mean of 2.16 for reading and writing combined, a helpful 2.32 for reading, and a helpful 1.99 for writing (see Table 13).

When the activities for the process of reading were compared with the activities for the process of writing by multivariate analysis of variance, the null hypothesis that the mean vectors for reading

Table 13

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Reading and Writing			2.16
Reading			2.32
1 Pre-reading, including asking the author an opening question and forming microcosmic sentences.	1.80	.72	
2 Noticing how authors lead readers from question to question, for instance from problem to cause to solution.	2.00	.51	
3 Breaking down long complex sentences into short understandable sentences.	2.13	.85	
4 Reading aloud essays from Riverside Reader or exercises from HCH to hear what is there.	2.38	1.01	
5 Evaluating essays and compositions as might Plato (truth, concern for readers, pleasingness) and Aristotle (unity of thought, development, orderliness).	2.50	.89	
6 Discussing essays, such as "The Knife" and Twain's essay on the Mississippi, in class.	2.22	.85	
7 Keeping a journal on non-assigned readings.	3.21	1.02	
Writing			1.99
1 Forming a mircocosmic sentence for one's own papers, sometimes using a pattern given in class.	1.50	.78	
2 Forming "steps" in a sentence outline for one's own compositions, sometimes during office conferences.	1.67	.82	
3 Combining short sentences so as to emphasize the main point and subordinate lesser facts, as in 24b of HCH.	1.92	.58	
4 Peer-editing and self-editing compositions to read what is there.	1.92	.78	
5 Using all of the instructor's reactions to rewrite compositions.	1.67	.70	

Table 13 (Cont.)

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
6 Listening to other students' compositions read aloud in class and talking about their strengths.	2.09	1.00	
7 Keeping a journal of free writing.	3.13	1.12	

N=24 except for 6 when N=23

activities and for writing activities were equally helpful was rejected F (7,15) = 5.56, $p < .0026$ (see Table 14). The instructional activities for writing were perceived as more helpful. Possible factors accounting for this outcome are that since the class was extraordinarily large, 28 students, beyond the university's limit of 25 and the profession's limit of 20, there was inadequate time for discussion of reading; that grading for the course still undervalued reading; and that activities for reading needed some improvement even though the 14 students in the pilot study gave no indication of a significant difference between the means of 2.21 for reading and 2.11 for writing. One student in the demonstration who was interviewed during the second-semester course in the spring remarked in regard to discussion of reading during the demonstration that "a smaller class might have helped; remember the snow day [when there was poor attendance in the second-semester course] when we talked like crazy?"

Interestingly, when the activity for each step in the process of reading was compared with the corresponding activity for each step in the process of writing, only the instructional activity for reading at

the fifth step, was seen as inferior to that for writing, F (1,21) = 20.77, $p < .0002$ (see Table 14). The mean for reading was 2.46 and for writing was 1.59. These freshmen perceived evaluating essays and compositions that they read as less helpful than using all of the instructor's reactions to rewrite compositions. Possible factors accounting for this particular perceived difference, in addition to the general factors mentioned earlier, were the limitations of students' and instructor's time for reading and the need to improve this instructional activity for reading even though students in the pilot study evaluated the activities similarly, having means of 1.86 and 1.86 (N=14).

Table 14

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of Activities for the Seven Recursive Steps in the Processes of Reading and of Writing by Means of Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Univariate Follow-up

Instructional Activity for Steps in Reading and Writing	Means		F	df	p
	Reading	Writing			
All Steps	2.31	1.96	5.56	7,15	.0026*
1	1.73	1.50	1.50	1,21	.2336
2	2.00	1.68	3.17	1,21	.0897
3	2.18	1.91	2.10	1,21	.1621
4	2.36	1.96	3.05	1,21	.0952
5	2.46	1.59	20.77	1,21	.0002*
6	2.23	2.00	1.50	1,21	.2336
7	3.18	3.09	.17	1,21	.6800

*Statistically significant with $p < .05$.
N=22

In order to clarify whether any individual instructional activity for a step in the process of reading was perceived as more helpful than any other activities for reading and whether any individual activity for a step in writing was perceived as more helpful than any other activities for writing, two one-way analyses of variance were used. Accordingly, both null hypotheses of equality were rejected, signifying that at least one activity in reading and one in writing were perceived as more helpful than other activities, F (6,126) = 6.95, $p < .0001$; F (6,126) = 11.35, $p < .0001$. Tukey follow-ups identified the more helpful activities. In reading, activities for steps 1, 2, 3, 6, and 4 were seen as more helpful than the activity for step 7 (see Table 15). In writing, activities at stages 1, 5, 2, 3, 4, and 6 were seen as more helpful than the activity for step 7.

The activities for step 7, keeping journals, had means of 3.18 and 3.09 which indicated that they were "sometimes helpful, sometimes not." Keeping a reading journal and a writing journal had been designed to develop fluency, enrichment, and originality. Either these activities needed refinement and/or some related factor, such as the amount of credit given for them in the course grade, needed improvement. The importance some students put on grades for their work appeared in the only two negative comments made on the SIRS: "We could revise but not receive a better grade in most cases"; "She was a fair teacher, basically; but she tells students they are doing good on a paper and when it is turned in grade is poor, doesn't give constrictive critism [sic]."

Table 15

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of Students' Perceptions of the Relative Helpfulness of the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Reading and the Activity for Each Step in the Process of Writing by Two One-Way Analyses of Variance

Step of Reading Activity	Means for Perception of Reading Activity	F	df	p
1	1.73			
2	2.00			
3	2.18			
6	2.23			
4	2.36			
5	2.46			
7	3.18			
All Steps		6.95	6,126	.0001*
Tukey follow up: 1,2,3,6 and 4 < 7				

Step of Writing Activity	Means for Perception of Writing Activity	F	df	p
1	1.50			
5	1.59			
2	1.68			
3	1.91			
4	1.96			
6	2.00			
7	3.09			
All Steps		11.35	6,126	.0001*
Tukey follow-up: 1-6 < 7				

*Statistically significant with $p < .05$.
N=22.

Students interviewed concerning these fourteen instructional activities were asked the question, "Were the steps in reading given on the handout and the steps in writing different drafts of any help?"

The students' replies along with the number of the step referred to were: "Yes, especially peer editing" (step 4); "Yes," in reading "I know who the writer is and understand better" (1,4), and in writing "I keep going back to see that I must add and take out" (1,2,3,4,5,); in reading "I used to skim, and now I re-read" (1,2,3,5), and in writing "I make a rough draft before I write a final one" (1,2,3,4); "[because of a visual handicap], these activities didn't work for me"; and "I liked hearing everyone else's papers read in class, peer editing, looking up the rules in HCH, and going over the exercises [in HCH and WW] in class" (6,4,5,3,4).

While discussing the outline (step 2) for a cause-effect analysis, the instructor made a discovery reported in the journal. Students had been asked to write either of two kinds of compositions, one with a cause described in the introduction and three or more effects described in the body paragraphs or one with an effect in the introduction and three or more causes in the body paragraphs. They had also been asked not to write a third kind of composition which described an effect which becomes a cause for a new effect, which becomes a cause for a new effect, and so forth because that kind of causal analysis is too complex to cover well in a 500-word essay. The instructor recorded becoming aware of another type, also too complex for students' present compositions. This type treated several causes which intricately interacted to produce an effect, paralleling interrelationships studied by statistical path analysis or LISREL. As part of learning to follow complex reading or to avoid overly complex writing, students benefited from the description of this type of causal analysis.

The evaluation of the instructional activities for steps in the processes of reading and writing having been described, it is possible to turn to the students' perceptions of the instruction in the course. While activities for steps in the processes of reading and writing were stressed, products were also described and used as models. On the average, these freshmen perceived the instruction in the course, as expressed on questions 3 to 6 and 9 to 10 on SIRS, as a helpful mean of 2.21 (see Table 16).

Table 16

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of the Instruction in the Course, as Expressed on the SIRS

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Perception of Instruction in the Course			2.21
SIRS-03 The instructor's use of examples or personal experiences helped get points across in class.	2.60	1.01	
SIRS-04 The instructor seemed concerned with whether the students learned the material.	1.59	.59	
SIRS-05 You were interested in learning the course material.	2.18	.73	
SIRS-06 You were generally attentive in class.	2.09	.68	
SIRS-09 The instructor encouraged students to express opinions.	2.32	1.13	
SIRS-10 The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and others' viewpoints.	2.46	.96	

N=22

In summary, the observations of the instructional activities for helping freshmen use the seven recursive steps in the processes of

reading and of writing indicated that, despite only moderate helpfulness of the step of reviewing and evaluating reading (step 5) and for the enrichment step of both reading and writing (7), the activities rated a helpful mean of 2.16 and seemed to be working.

Transferability Along with Skills and Arts Shown in the Course's Products of Reading and Writing

Although the expected outcome of this course was improvement in both reading and writing skills and arts as indicated by the cloze reading samples and the Buxton-scored writing samples, the special outcome that the instructional activities were designed to achieve was transferability. The activities for the later outcome included demonstrating dialogical communication in the classroom setting, allowing freshmen to discover relationships between reading and writing, providing a strengthening exercise for interrelating reading and writing, and suggesting ways to transfer dialogical communication between reading and writing to other disciplines.

The instruments for observing instructional activities directed toward samples, were the Goodman miscue analysis of several cloze reading tests, two short-answer questions on the questionnaire on instructional activities, student interviews, and the instructor's journal. Successful transfer of learning from writing to reading is suggested by a comparison of Goodman miscue analyses of three students' pre-cloze reading samples and their post-cloze reading samples. In general, the three randomly selected students read with greater emphasis on the central idea, the author's voice, overall coherence, and appropriateness of diction. For example, when a young woman read the pre-sample, she read without attention to cues from

sentence structure, substituted her own thoughts for those of the author, failed to slow down to see what was there in the text, and scored 42; when she read the post-sample, she evidenced clear logic and awareness of cues for coherence and scored 48. When a young man took the pre-sample, he failed to re-read so as to pick up cues of the pattern of organization, used overly general vocabulary, showed that he needed to read more essays, and scored 42; when he read the post-sample, he evidenced that he cared enough to re-read since he wrote answers lightly at first and later darkened or erased them, selected more specific vocabulary, and scored 64. When a creative young man read the pre-sample, he failed to pick up the voice of the author, imposed his own voice into the passage, and scored 44; when he read the post-sample, he made great and successful efforts, attested to by eleven alterations, to attune himself to the author's voice and subject matter, and he scored 64.

All 21 students who responded at all to the question on the questionnaire on instructional activities concerning whether reading helped writing answered affirmatively. They gave varied explanations. Some "got specific ideas" from reading, and some discovered the importance of knowing the audience and "how to appeal to the readers to make them ask questions." Many explained that reading helped them in the steps in the process of writing; reading provided "different ways to lead into and conclude the essay," enabled them to "clarify how respected writers form specific ideas in their own specific styles," helped them "polish grammar and usage," and showed ways to "make shorter sentences that make stronger statements." At least 10 explained that reading provided examples of a "finished product."

During the interviews, all students stated that reading helped them to write. One student stated, "I could organize thoughts better; I used to hate writing and find it hard till I learned outlining."

In response to the question of whether writing helped improve reading, 16 of the 18 students answering replied affirmatively, 2 noticing no effect. Several explained that writing helped understand "what I was reading," that "I looked more to the audience and what the author was trying to present to this specific audience," and that writing "helped me to recognize what other authors were trying to get across to me." Another student said, "Reading came easier." Many found writing helped them with the steps in the process of reading so as to "read more closely and look for details"; and another said, "Writing has made me more aware of the way I speak and the words I choose; now I pay more attention to the way authors use sentences when I am reading." At least 5 freshmen found that writing different types of papers helped in reading because "you are able to tell how the author is writing and understand the essay better" and also are able to "identify different types of compositions immediately." During the interview, one student stated that writing helped re-reading her own paper; and another student stated that "writing could help you find a thesis in reading; you need to read closely because it's hard to get the thesis."

Indications of broader transfer were recorded. Anonymously on the SIRS, one person wrote, "I have enjoyed myself in this class; I have also learned very much and will take what I have learned to help me in my other English classes." Five students expressed the likelihood of transfer to other courses, saying, for instance, that writing

"bettered my grade in some classes" and would help in future "essay examinations in history" or "term papers."

According to the instructor's journal, dated October 3rd, an incident occurred which suggested how transfer occurs in the present with possibilities for occurring in a different way in the future. The article discussed, "Presidential Character and How to Foresee It" (Barber, 1972/1981), contained a classification of presidents made on two dimensions, activity or passivity and positive or negative affect towards their work, forming a matrix analogous to that of a two-way analysis of variance. After discussion of the essay was completed, everyone turned to the blackboard to review a student's outline for a paper to be developed by classification. The author and the rest of the class discovered that the author had unsuccessfully attempted to use two dimensions and that using two dimensions was difficult. Still students could see how it was possible to read and write more advanced essays in the future.

In summary, there was substantial evidence that instructional activities directed towards transfer between reading and writing were helpful and that additional broader transfer is likely to occur in the future. The evaluation of the traditional assignment of nine essays to read and nine to write and the associated skills and arts revealed in the products will now be reported.

According to the cloze reading samples based on the passages used, these freshmen improved reading to statistically and practically significant degrees. Data from the cloze reading samples were analyzed in three ways. First, the data were analyzed by a dependent *t*-test at the .01 level of significance. The mean of scores on the

pre-samples was 46.00 and on the post-samples was 59.50. The null hypothesis that reading was no better at the end of the course than at the beginning was rejected (see Table 17), t (23) = -7.41, $p < .001$. Thus, it can be said that these freshmen improved in reading skills and arts. The results may also be analyzed in terms of Bormuth's (cited in Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 586) standards for reading levels. On the pre-samples, 12 students read the passage at the frustrational level, 6 at the instructional level, and 6 at the independent level. On the post-samples, 1 student read the passage at the frustrational level, 6 students at the instructional level, and 17 at the independent level. Finally, according to item 7 of the Goodman miscue analysis, three randomly selected students who had 11, 16, and 2 changes in meaning on the pre-samples made 2, 2, and 0 changes in meaning on the post-samples. The cloze reading samples corroborate statistically and practically significant improvement in these students' skills and arts of reading.

According to the Buxton-scored writing samples written on the topics specified and reviewed wholistically and analytically, these freshmen improved skills and arts of writing to statistically and practically significant degrees. Wholistic eview gave an overall writing score. Analytical review gave ratings of rhetorical effectiveness and errors per thousand words. Each item was analyzed by a t-test with level of significance set at .01. The mean overall writing score for the pre-samples was 27.40 and for the post-samples was 48.35. The null hypothesis that the overall writing was no better at the end of the course than at the beginning was rejected (see Table 17), t (23) = -8.07, $p < .001$. The mean of rhetorical

Table 17

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Achievements in Reading According to the Cloze Reading Samples and in Writing According to the Buxton-Scored Writing Samples

Test		Mean	S. Dev.	Mean Difference	Standard Deviation Difference	df	t	2-tail prob
Cloze Reading Tests	Pre-	46.00	8.98	-13.50	8.93	23	-7.41	.001*
	Post-	59.50	8.05					
Buxton-Scored Writing Samples								
Overall Writing Score	Pre-	27.40	11.08	-20.96	12.72	23	-8.07	.001*
	Post-	48.35	9.77					
Rhetorical Effectiveness	Pre-	96.21	14.14	-16.77	22.07	23	-3.72	.001*
	Post-	112.98	19.31					
Errors Per Thousand Words	Pre-	89.00	29.28	46.09	28.77	23	7.85	.001*
	Post-	42.92	20.01					
Number of Errors	Pre-	21.67	9.61	11.96	10.81	23	5.42	.001*
	Post-	9.71	5.43					

* Statistically significant with $p < .01$.
N=24

effectiveness for the pre-samples was 96.21 and for the post-samples was 112.98. The null hypothesis that rhetorical effectiveness was no better at the end of the course than at the beginning was rejected, $t(23) = -3.72$, $p < .001$. The mean of the errors per thousand words for the pre-samples was 89.00 and for the post-samples 42.92. The null

hypothesis that the errors per thousand words were no fewer at the end of the course than at the beginning was rejected, t (23) = 7.85, p < .001. The mean of the errors for the pre-samples was 21.67 and for the post-samples was 9.71. The null hypothesis that the number of errors at the end of the course was no smaller than the number at the beginning was rejected, t (23) = 5.42, p < .001. In each area, one can say at the .01 level of significance that students improved in the skills and arts of writing as measured by the Buxton-scored writing samples.

Students interviewed four months after the course was completed revealed a sense of having made various and definite improvements in both reading and writing. One student reported, "I am more prepared; I learned one pattern at a time and knew what I was doing." Another explained, "In reading I used to skim to find the high points, and now I go deeper; in writing, oh, yes, definitely, since I write more formally." Along with these evidences of students' success, the instructor, according to a journal entry, wondered whether there was time for in-class and out-of-class instructional activities to teach both reading and writing, especially after having read, marked, made suggestions on, and evaluated compositions and evaluated summaries of reading until two in the morning.

All students passed the final 500-word essay-examination. On the average these freshmen, according to four questions on the SIRS, perceived that they made achievements in the course at the rate of a helpful mean of 2.16 and that they learned about 80 per cent of the course material (see Table 18).

Table 18

Demonstration: Results of Quantitative Measures of the Students' Perceptions of Their Achievements in the Course, As Expressed on the SIRS

	Mean	S. Dev.	Overall Mean
Freshmen Perceptions of Achievement			2.16
SIRS-08 You have become more competent in this area due to this course.	1.96	.84	
SIRS-21 This course made a significant contribution to your overall personal educational objectives.	2.09	.87	
SIRS-22 What percentage of the course material covered do you feel you actually learned? (1) more than 90%, (2) about 80%, (3) about 70%, (4) about 60%, and (5) less than 60%.	2.23	1.15	
SIRS-23 The instructor adequately assessed how well students mastered the course objectives.	2.36	.79	

N=22

Since all observational instruments record that students made definite improvements in both reading and writing, it may be concluded that the dialogical reading and writing of more than nine compositions worked well.

In summary, the instructional activities for transfer of learning were substantially helpful while the assignments for reading and writing improved students' skills and arts of reading as measured by cloze-reading tests, and of writing, as measured by Buxton-scored writing samples, to statistically and practically significant degrees. It is interesting to note that all twenty-four students passed the course and that at least ten students sought out the instructor's section for the subsequent course.

Major Instruments

The two quantitative instruments which measured several of the instructional activities were evaluated. The questionnaire on instructional activities was judged to be a valuable instrument for gaining students' perceptions; it could be improved with Likert-scaled items on instructional activities for developmental sequencing and for transfer. Then, item analysis could be done. When the relevant questions were selected, the SIRS, which mixed evaluation of course, instructor, and student, was useful for observing students' perceptions not so much of the instructional activities but of various facets of the course.

The two qualitative instruments covered several instructional activities. Student interviews effectively provided expressions of students' perceptions in their own language and added concreteness to the abstractness of quantitative instruments. Interviews should include a question on the amount of time the students spent in studying for the course. The instructor's journal served as a valuable instrument for recording discoveries about content of the course as well as for recording the degree of success of instructional activities. An extraordinarily meaningful addition would be recording the time spent on various types of activities relevant to the course.

Two instruments measured freshmen's achievements in the arts and skills of reading and of writing. Each was evaluated.

The cloze-reading samples had content validity and functioned well, especially when augmented by the Goodman miscue analysis. Three of the passages used for cloze reading samples have been reviewed for validity of measuring the grade level. These passages were tested

post hoc for syntactic maturity, that is the number of words per independent clause, and by applying the Fry readability formula with Lapp and Flood's correction (1978). Applying the Fry readability formula requires that a researcher select one 100-word passage from near the beginning, the middle, and the end of a text; count the total number of sentences and average them by dividing by 3; count the total number of syllables and divide by 3; and plot the results on a graph (Lapp & Flood, 1978, p. 563). To give greater validity, according to Lapp and Flood (1978), one adds .865 to the grade level thus plotted.

The results of this testing were mixed as to what level each passage represented. The selection on "Jobs in Science," used as pre-sample in the pilot study and the demonstration, was rated by SRA as 12th of 20 for college preparatory, senior high school; had 13.20 words per independent clause; and was evaluated at 14.97 by Lapp and Flood's correction of Fry (see Table 19). The selection adapted from The Hidden Persuaders, used as post-sample in the demonstration, was rated by SRA as 14th of 20 for college preparatory, senior high school; had 17.65 words per independent clause; and was evaluated at 12.47 by Lapp and Flood's correction of Fry's formula. The selection from Language for Everyone, used as post-sample in the pilot study, was rated by SRA as 19th of 20 for college preparatory, senior high school; had 23.08 words per independent clause; and was evaluated 15.77 by the Lapp and Flood correction. It is interesting to note that the post-sample passage for the demonstration was rated as more difficult than the pre-sample passage according to SRA, syntactic maturity, and length of sentences. However, it was rated less difficult according to syllables per hundred words and Lapp and

Table 19

Comparison of Three Passages Used in the Cloze-Reading Samples for the Pilot Study and the Demonstration

	Pre-Sample in Pilot Study and Demonstration	Post-Sample in Demonstration	Post-Sample in Pilot Study
Title	"Jobs in Science"	From The Hidden Persuaders	From Language for Everyone
SRA Rating	12th grade, 12th selection of 20	12th grade, 14th selection of 20	12th grade, 19th selection of 20
Syntactic Maturity/ Words Per Independent Clause	13.20	17.65	23.08
Sentences Per 100 Words	5.96	5.40	3.60
Syllables Per 100 Words	172.00	161.30	169.60
Plotted Fry Rating	14.10 (early university sophomore)	11.66 (late 11th grade)	14.90 (late university sophomore)
Lapp and Flood Correction of Fry Rating	14.97 (late university sophomore)	12.47 (middle of 12th grade)	15.77 (late university junior)

Flood's correction of the Fry readability formula. Not one of the measures covered all the aspects that make a passage readable.

Also, instructions to students need consideration. Freshmen taking the test need to be told that they should approximate the author's attitude and usage in every way, that they should use one

word or a hyphenated word in each blank regardless of the length of the blank, and that they may write in pencil first so as to erase later if they choose to.

The Buxton-scored writing samples have content validity, and the Buxton scale is extraordinarily well suited to research. The procedure for scoring the samples could be somewhat refined to insure greater inter-rater reliability. The inter-rater reliability for the overall writing score was .8321 (N=24, $p < .001$), although the coefficient of reliability for rhetorical effectiveness was .5424 (N=24, $p < .003$). The scorers approached the rhetorical effectiveness of the writing samples with slightly different expectations, one scorer expecting structure on the pattern of the five-paragraph theme and one scorer valuing originality in varied shapes. Since there is some merit in both structure and flexibility (McColly, 1970) and since the scorers would have had difficulty changing approaches, it was decided at the time of scoring to agree as much as possible and to allow the averaging of the two scores to overcome the differences. However, it might be possible to set standards at what would be expected in regard to degree of formality and creativity at the middle of the semester. This instrument, though time-consuming to use, was evaluated as highly effective.

In general, the observational instruments were valid for their purposes and nearly as reliable as present research could make them.

Summary of the Description, Observational Methods, and Evaluation of the Demonstration

The demonstration of the set of dialogical activities took place in a section of standard first-semester English in a large urban state university. The 24 students who completed the course out of the 28

registered averaged approximately 20 in ACT-English. The set of dialogical activities described in Chapter III were used while the standard goals for the course set by the department of English were met.

The pilot study and the demonstration of the set of instructional activities were observed by six instruments: a questionnaire on instructional activities, the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS) for assessment of the course, student interviews, instructor's journal, cloze reading samples, and Buxton-scored writing samples. The raw data were analyzed by appropriate procedures. The analyzed results were then presented in the appropriate category of the four types of activities. Evaluation of whether the activities were working was made. The pilot study facilitated using the entire set of activities and refining the instruments.

The results of the demonstration were the following quantitative outcomes, which were consonant with qualitative outcomes. The Likert scale was one as "very helpful" to five as "a hindrance." The instructional activity for centering the course on dialogue rated a more than helpful mean of 1.83, although the goals of the course rated a mean of 2.28. The activities for developmental sequencing rated a helpful mean of 2.02, although the course demands rated a mean of 3.14. The fourteen activities for teaching steps in the processes of reading and writing were rated as a helpful mean of 2.16, with means of 2.32 for reading and of 1.99 for writing. There were strong indications of transfer between reading and writing and of transfer beyond. Meanwhile achievements in reading and writing moved from means of 46.0 to 59.5 and 27.4 to 48.4; the improvements were statistically significant, $\underline{t}$ (23) = -7.41, $\underline{p} < .001$ and $\underline{t}$ (23) = -8.07,

$p < .001$. Though minor refinement is possible in each instrument, each instrument is valid in its area and reasonably reliable.

From the observation of the demonstration, the conclusion must be reached that this set of dialogical activities for improving communication by first-semester freshmen through teaching reading literature and writing compositions interrelatedly seemed to work helpfully, having an overall mean of 2.00, for these students and are likely to help similar students with similar instructors in similar circumstances in the future.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

First, this chapter summarizes the results of all findings. These findings include the need and purpose of helping freshmen improve communication through written discourse; the research-based criteria for developing instructional activities to accomplish this purpose; the set of activities selected, modified, or created; and the results of the evaluation of a one-semester demonstration of the activities that determined which activities seemed to work and what refinement in activities or observational instruments was advisable. Then, these findings are discussed to discover some reasons for them. Finally, the implications of the findings for theory, practice, and further research follow.

Summary of Findings

1. The many-faceted problem is that too many university freshmen who complete the standard first semester of English have not reached levels of communication through reading and writing acceptable for meeting immediate needs or laying foundations for future learning. These freshmen often write correctly and mindlessly, regard writing with distaste, write inefficiently, and develop weak skills in reading and inflexible skills in writing unlikely to transfer into future learning. These inadequacies in students' written discourse were

explained by many interrelated factors, involving planners, students, and instructors. Some planners of this course in English initiated narrow goals of correctness of writing without consideration for critical thinking and creative formation of values; pressured students to accomplish in one semester objectives beyond their stage of psycholinguistic development; provided an inadequate number of weekly class meetings for instructors to help large numbers of students practice methods and develop skills for written discourse; and unsoundly assumed that teaching writing skills eliminated the need for reading and will readily bring transfer of learning into future classes. Some students too wanted merely technical training, neglected assignments to work for pay or to relax, looked for simple formulas rather than thorough methods, and pressed for simple-answer examinations to receive credit for the course. In these circumstances, some instructors presented the goals unenthusiastically, tried to force-feed students the learning required by planners, described products while neglecting methods, and taught specialized skills of writing out of the context of communication.

Although this many-faceted problem with its complex and interconnected explanations can be resolved largely by planners and to some extent by students, some contribution to the resolution can be made by instructors who take certain steps to improve instructional activities. An instructor-researcher could seek a sound philosophy of written discourse to meet and surpass narrow goals, use research on psycholinguistic development in students of typical freshman age so as to increase expectations gradually, investigate the processes of communication through reading and writing to give them some attention,

and find activities for teaching both reading and writing that facilitate transfer between reading and writing and beyond. Fully developing a set of instructional activities for teaching both reading and writing was the general purpose of this study.

The administrative setting for the instructional activities posed difficulty. Research showed that reading as well as writing had to be taught directly. Enlarging the body of content implied enlarging the course time for studying it. Separate required courses for reading and writing had been unsatisfactory and were unfeasible. On the other hand, research showed that potential benefits could accrue from teaching reading and writing interrelatedly, for their goals have similarities, reading can serve as a precursor for writing, methods have similarities, and transfer of learning between reading and writing is possible. To gain benefits of the small but significant correlation between reading and writing, an instructor would probably need at least a four credit-hour course composed of three hours of class and two hours of laboratory. Since such a course arrangement was not possible at the time and since no set of instructional activities was located in the literature, it was decided to design activities despite the three-credit-hour framework. Thus, the specific purpose of this study was to thoroughly develop one set of instructional activities needed for teaching communication to first-semester university freshmen through learning activities for reading and writing English presented interrelatedly within one standard course to enable students to reach levels acceptable for meeting their immediate academic and personal goals and sound enough to serve as foundations for future growth.

2. Four criteria for selecting, modifying, or creating activities to form the set were deduced from the literature of philosophy of communication, psycholinguistics, processes of communicating through reading and writing, and transfer of learning. The criteria are that the instructional activities should be oriented not towards mere correctness but especially toward beginning academic dialogue; be suited not merely to serving others' goals but particularly to developing university freshmen as authentic communicators; be focused not only on the product but chiefly on the processes of interacting through reading and writing; and be directed not merely to achievement in skills and arts but strongly toward synergistic transfer of learning from each form of discourse to the other and beyond, resulting in true literacy.

3. Four types of instructional activities designed and described formed a coherent set. First, the course, although including correctness, was centered on the definition of the ideal dialogue, that "serious address between two or more persons in which the being and truth of each is confronted by the being and truth of the other" (Howe, 1963, p. 4); this definition evolved into questions concerning the active participant, the unseen participant and the series of exchanges between them, questions which were to be asked whenever a person is reading or is writing. Secondly, learning opportunities in the course, while meeting departmental standards for passing, were sequenced to encourage development of authentic communicators by moving from instructor leadership to student self-direction, reading to writing, informal voice to formal voice, audiences of peers to audiences of negative adults, and exposition by narration to simple

argument by problem-cause-solution. These sequenced learning opportunities formed the underlying chronological plan for the semester. Then, although products were also to be described and used as models, activities for carrying out each of the seven recursive steps in the process of interacting through reading and in the process of interacting through writing were designed; the instructor demonstrated creating the microcosmic question and answer, dialogical sentence-outlining of sub-questions and answers, dialogical sentence-debining and sentence-combining, seeing what is there on the page, using reviews by helpful others, sharing and responding, and keeping journals for enrichment. These activities were described as used in an illustrative two-week lesson on comparison and contrast. Last, activities to stress transfer, while students read and wrote at least nine essays, were these: exemplifying dialogical communication in the classroom, allowing freshmen to discover relationships between reading and writing, providing a strengthening exercise for interrelating reading and writing, and suggesting ways to transfer learning to other situations.

4. The evaluation of this set of instructional activities in a demonstration observed by six instruments indicated that almost all worked as a helpful mean of 2, the scale being 1 as "very helpful," 2 as "helpful," 3 as "sometimes helpful, sometimes not," 4 as "not helpful," and 5 as "a hindrance." The instruments for observing the activities were a questionnaire on activities, the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS), student interviews, the instructor's daily journal, cloze reading samples augmented by Goodman miscue analysis, and Buxton-scored writing samples with an overall

score augmented by scores for rhetorical effectiveness and errors per thousand words. First, the evaluation of the activities in a pilot study with sixteen students who had a mean average score in ACT-English of 15.7 indicated that the students perceived the activities as helpful mean of 2.07, although the cloze reading samples and Buxton-scored writing samples as administered did not show significant gains. Then, the evaluation of the improved instructional activities in a demonstration with 24 university students who had a mean score in ACT-English of approximately 20 indicated that the activities worked overall as a helpful 2.00, while they improved reading and writing to a statistically and practically significant degree as measured by samples.

The evaluation of each of the four types of instructional activities indicated that almost all were helpful. The activity of centering the course on dialogue which exceeded mere correctness rated a more than helpful mean of 1.83, although goals of the course rated 2.28. The activities for developmental sequencing rated a helpful 2.02, although the demands of the course rated only 3.14. The fourteen activities for carrying out the steps in the processes of reading and writing were rated a helpful 2.16, 2.32 for reading and 1.99 for writing, while the instruction in the course rated 2.21. Not only did 21 students affirm transfer from reading to writing and 16 students from writing to reading, but also, according to objective tests, students improved their reading and their writing to practically and statistically significant degrees, $\underline{t}$ (23) = -7.41, $\underline{p} < .001$ and $\underline{t}$ (23) -8.07, $\underline{p} < .001$.

The three activities for carrying out steps in the processes of communicating through written discourse which were perceived as more than "helpful" addressed writing: forming a microcosmic sentence, mean of 1.50; substantially rewriting compositions, mean of 1.59; and dialogical sentence outlining, mean of 1.68 (see Table 15). The activities which were perceived as "sometimes helpful, sometimes not" were keeping reading journals, mean of 3.18; keeping writing journals, mean of 3.09; and evaluating essays and compositions read, mean of 2.46.

The set of six observational instruments gave many-sided, qualitative and quantitative perspectives on the demonstration, although a few refinements in the instruments would be beneficial. The questionnaire on activities could include Likert-scaled items on developmental sequencing and on the transfer between reading and writing. For the SIRS, researchers could substitute Witte, Daly, Faigley, and Kochs' (1983) instrument for evaluating instruction in English. If interviews of freshmen are lengthened and cover the time spent in studying, formal content analysis could be applied. The instructor's journal should be enlarged to log the time given to various course-related activities. After passages have been measured by the Fry readibility formula or a similar or improved instrument, the pre-cloze reading samples and post-cloze reading samples could be administered so that the two passages are given to different halves of the class on each occasion. The pre-Buxton-scored samples and the post-Buxton-scored samples could also be administered by the Latin square format and scored according to tight mid-semester-level standards.

Thus the set of instructional activities was, as used in the closely observed demonstration, evaluated as significantly and practically helpful to these university freshmen and probably to similar university freshmen under similar circumstances.

Discussion of Findings

1. The magnitude and complexity of the problem in freshman English as herein delineated suggests that the solutions will require enormous, clear-sighted efforts on the part of many planners and students as well as of instructors. Comparison and contrast of the pilot study and the demonstration clarify the need for great efforts. It is clear that although the instructional activities, the course, the texts, and the instructor were identical or almost identical in the pilot study and the demonstration, the students in the demonstration, who had a mean score in ACT-English of 20, achieved far higher scores on the reading and writing samples than did the students in the pilot study, who had a mean score in ACT-English of 15.7 For example, the students in the demonstration reduced their errors by 48 per cent while the students in the pilot study reduced their errors by 6 per cent. This situation suggests that instructional activities alone do not and will not solve the problem. Thoughtful planners consider alternatives, such as establishing sound procedures for placing students in groups or sections which focus on what the students need to learn, finding fully qualified instructors, providing adequate hours for class meetings, and holding classes to reasonable numbers of students. Surely the professionals in English must assist in this planning.

2. The research for criteria on which to base efforts to resolve all aspects of the problem is widely scattered among many disciplines and in disparate studies, forming a further deterrent to solving the problem efficiently. Few researchers are making the integrations needed.

3. The set of instructional activities described here and based on a number of authoritative studies in each of four disciplines provides a large segment of such an effort. Taking the activities, designed on the basis of criteria found in research, and placing them on a large sheet in a matrix, as described in Chapter III, provides for instructors' frequent references to the course goals, progress through time, attention to reading and writing within each lesson, and focus on the transfer of learning.

4. It is especially valuable also to consider reasons why most activities seemed to work helpfully to meet students' needs; why only a few were "sometimes helpful, sometimes not"; and why none was "not helpful" or "a hindrance." Suggested reasons why each of the four types of activities was evaluated as it was in the demonstration follow.

The activity of centering the course on dialogue received a mean of 1.83 and warm praise from interviewees, correctness being improved also. Perhaps the freshmen liked as well as profited from a deeper, more mature, more challenging, and fresher approach than is often found in grammar-oriented or writing-dominated courses. This activity which permeated the course probably motivated students, unified the course, and helped students learn.

The activities for developmentally sequencing the learning opportunities of the course, which brought a helpful mean, 2.02, and praise from those who appreciated the "building into" or "onto" that occurred, seemed to have reduced anxiety and introduced the variety that prevented dullness. Nevertheless, students saw course demands, rated 3.14, as burdensome, probably because the course required too many papers written in too short a period of time. The instructor too was burdened.

The three activities in the processes of written discourse rated as more than helpful--forming the microcosmic sentence, 1.50, using the instructor's reactions to rewrite compositions, 1.59, and shaping the dialogical outline, 1.68--took a great deal of class time, student time, and instructor time; they were well rewarded by grades; they involved challenging, intense mental exertion; and once understood by students, they seemed to have inherent strength. It is truly noteworthy that students perceived forming the microcosmic sentences, shaping dialogical outlines, and substantially revising papers as the three most valued activities for carrying out the processes of reading and writing in light of the fact that outlining and revision have been scorned by certain educators. The value may lie partly in the philosophical, dialogical framework in which they were set.

The three activities in carrying out the processes of written discourse rated as "sometimes helpful, sometimes not"--keeping reading journals, 3.18; keeping writing journals, 3.09; and evaluating essays and compositions read, 2.46--were given little class, student, or instructor time; they were poorly rewarded by grades; they were not made challenging enough; and they seemed not to have an inherent

strength to provide momentum for continued use. If more time were available for students and instructor, the keeping of reading and writing journals could be improved by gradually building them from free reading and free writing to thoughtful descriptions of problems encountered in reading, writing, or living along with solutions to the problems. Fulwiler and Young's (1982) Language Connections provide concrete suggestions. The activity for the fifth step in the process of reading is evaluating essays and compositions read, rated 2.46. It took far less class, student, or instructor time than the corresponding activity for the fifth stage in writing, using all of the instructor's reactions to rewrite compositions, rated 1.59. If more time were available, students could read passages aloud for peers, the class, or the instructor, or they could interpret essays on paper. Many students understand a text only after reading it aloud and writing about it. These activities must be graded and given at least minimal credit in the final grade of the course.

Besides signs of improving transfer, these 24 students made truly remarkable achievements in both the skills and arts of reading and of writing. They read more than nine essays and wrote and revised nine essays.

These students' achievements in reading are outstanding when compared with those in other research on freshmen English courses. Major studies referred to in Chapter I that reported statistically significant improvement shown in writing sampled did not report statistically significant improvement in reading. For the present study, also the students' mean improvement in reading from the instructional level, 46.00, to independent reading level, 59.50, is practically as well as statistically significant.

These student's achievements in writing compare favorably in overall improvement with those of students in Buxton's (1958) experiment and in Kitzhaber's (1963) longitudinal study. During six months of English, students in the Buxton's experimental group who wrote and revised under an instructor's guidance moved from 40.67 to 51.79, a gain in overall writing score of 11.12 or 27 per cent. During only one semester of English, students in this demonstration who wrote and revised under an instructor's guidance moved from 27.40 to 48.35, a scaled-score gain of 20.95 or 75 per cent.

Further, the freshmen in Buxton's experimental group reduced the number of errors from 30.8 per thousand words to 21.5, an improvement of 9.3 errors or 30 per cent. The first-semester freshmen at Dartmouth in Kitzhaber's empirical study reduced the number of errors from 24.5 to 16.2, an improvement of 8.3 errors or 33 per cent. The freshmen in the demonstration reduced the number of errors from 89.0 per thousand words to 42.9, an improvement of 46.1 errors or 52 per cent. Therefore, it seems likely that the student-writers made improvement not only statistically significant and practically significant but also professionally significant.

While both reading and writing improved, 21 students asserted transfer from reading to writing and 16 students asserted transfer from writing to reading. This result suggests synergism in operation.

The method of evaluating the set of instructional activities in the observed demonstration seemed to work well. The use of this procedure for evaluation is wholistic, unlike much research which is necessarily atomistic. Stufflebeam's (1970/1973) CIPP model of evaluation covered contexts, input, process, and product rather than

merely objective and product. It employed many types of observation: library research, philosophical analysis, thinking in matrices so helpful in eliminating overlapping categories and in filling empty ones, some description, and a wide range of statistical procedures. This kind of research is likely to meet requirements of lay as well as professional audiences, and it allows the balancing of a quantitative MANOVA with qualitative interviews containing such expressions as a girl softball player's comment: "I steal words from other writers."

All in all, the set of instructional activities seemed to work helpfully because it fostered disciplined creativity.

Implications of Findings for Theory, Practice, and Future Research

The findings have several implications for theory, practice, and further research. The implications of findings will be presented in this order: those concerning the problem, those concerning research for resolving non-instructional aspects of the problem, those concerning the set of instructional activities designed in this study, and those concerning each of the four types of activities in the set.

1. If the professionals in English are to assist in planning solutions for the whole many-faceted problem in freshman English, they need to unite. Possibly a simple professional organization for accreditation of departments of English may be formed to review major aspects of the course, such as class size and credit hours, and to establish and monitor a few major standards.

2. Since additional cross-disciplinary research is needed as a basis for resolving non-instructional aspects of the problem, integrative research must be supported at the highest level.

3. This set or similar sets of instructional activities should be tested through research of high quality. Substantial grants may be needed to carry out such research in designs that account for many intricately related variables.

4. Since students find the set of activities helpful, perhaps because the activities are fresh, varied, intensely active, and synergistic, each type of activity has specific implications for theory, practice, and further research.

The success of the first type of activity and sub-activities built on the philosophical concept of dialogue and perceived by these freshmen as a more than helpful mean of 1.83 implies that this or another clearly stated philosophy of communication may be an essential foundation point for English courses, English programs, and even education itself. Many professionals in English recognize that communication through written discourse is not a technology but a liberal art, one of the humanities. Planners can use philosophical analysis to clarify whether the guiding goals of the course should be short-term goals, liberal goals, or a combination of practical and liberal goals. In fact, data from this demonstration could be further analyzed in terms of whether the liberal-practical goals of critical thinking and the affective arts of value creation, as measured in thirteen sub-categories of rhetorical effectiveness on the Buxton-scored writing samples, have improved. Such a further study is planned.

The helpfulness of the second type of activity, that for developmental sequencing in the course, implies that much consideration should be given to finding suitable relationships

between educational nurture and natural psycholinguistic development and to putting the findings into practice in secondary school English, first-semester university English, and subsequent university English courses. Secondary school students should be able to write short expository compositions. If a first-semester freshman writes a 500-word essay comparison or classification essay using one criterion for analysis, perhaps a subsequent course could require longer essays using two or even three criteria. It may be advisable to reduce expectations of the first semester and extend some expectations over four years. Careful attention to students' levels of preparation and course completion is essential to gain most benefits from such planning. But even then, if these freshmen are to receive competent instruction, the pressure on the instructors must be reduced in some way. At present the most-helpful activities are the most time-consuming. If instructors are too pressed, they may avoid those most-helpful activities. A piece of research needed at once is an observation of this set of activities with careful recording of the time for all activities of learning and of instructing, sub-divided into such categories as preparation and office conferences.

The active and demanding role played by the freshmen in carrying out the third type of activity, that is practicing the seven steps in the processes of reading and of writing, implies that the course should be regarded as a skills course; should have an appropriate setting, such as a workshop or laboratory; and, should be given appropriate course credit, for example, three credits for class and one-credit for a two-hour laboratory. This set of activities could then be taught by fully qualified instructors to 20 students in this enlarged setting.

Furthermore, although the students found the course demands heavy, the instructor worked many hours, the instructional activities were helpful, and the errors per thousand words were reduced by the comparatively high degree of 52 per cent, the number of errors made by these students at the end of the course, 42.9 per thousand words, exceeded not only the number made by Dartmouth's students in Kitzhaber's (1963) study at the end of the first semester, 16.2, but even the number Dartmouth's students made at the beginning of the semester, 24.5. This set of circumstances strongly implies that enabling these students, who took the course as their first university English course, to reach equality in correctness of writing with students like those at Dartmouth at the end of one semester will require not merely improvements in first-semester English but even additional required courses.

It is possible to use the fourth type of activities and assignments to teach both reading and writing in the same classroom, although added time should be provided for teaching both. The correlation between reading and writing is reported by various sources in Chapter I as a variety of figures between .13 and .50, implying that both reading and writing must be taught to gain measurable benefit. In fact, teaching both reading and writing interrelatedly may well be the principle way to gain the benefit of transfer of learning and the synergistic effect recorded in this study. It may also be the best way to prepare students for reading and writing across the curriculum. Separate classes for teaching reading and writing might be observed to see what degree of transfer exists.

Now that the set of activities has been founded, described, observed, and evaluated as helpful and that instruments for observations are available, this set of activities may be compared with other sets of instructional activities. Such comparisons may be made through experimental designs that take into account additional variables, such as instructors.

The overall helpfulness and development of skill and arts in this demonstration of the instructional activities also implies that every institution needs to be aware of the difference between a marketplace model of education and a long-term, practical-liberal model. Although the cost of the first may be less in the short-term, the cost of the second may be far less in the long-term. Then first-semester freshmen are more likely to meet immediate academic and personal goals and to lay sound foundations for the next three and one-half years of growth in ability to communicate through written discourse.

Once more the world stands in need of genuine communication through written discourse. Once more mankind can choose full comprehension and full comprehensivity through learning the "new old" (Keats, 1818/1952) English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, M. (1952). Sweetness and light. Culture and anarchy. In H. Spencer, W. Houghton, & H. Barrows (Eds.), British literature from Blake to the present day (Vol. 2, pp. 758-769). Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. (Original work published in 1869)

Association of Departments of English, ADE Class Size and Workload Revision Committee, Arthur B. Coffin, Chair. (1980). Guidelines for class size and workload for college and university teachers of English: A statement of policy by the Association of Departments of English. 62 Fifth Avenue, New York 10011: ADE.

Bacon, F. (1968). The idols. From Novum organum. In M. H. Abrams (Ed.), The Norton anthology of English literature (rev. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 1217-1223). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. (Original work published in 1620)

Barabas, C. (1980, March). Idea combining: Synthesizing syntax and meaning. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Washington, DC.

Barber, J. (1981). Introduction to The presidential character: Predicting performance in the White House. In J. Trimmer and M. Hariston, The riverside reader (pp. 254-261). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. (Original work published in 1972)

Battle, M. V. (1954). A study of the drama criticism of Jacques Copeau as contained in "Critiques d'un autre temps." Unpublished master's thesis, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.

Battle, M. V. (1980, March). Error reduction by freshman writers and its relationship to grouping. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference of College Composition and Communication, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 188 170).

Battle, M. V. (1981). Preliminary notes on annotating freshman compositions. Unpublished manuscript.

Bennett, W. (1984). To reclaim a legacy. Chronical of Higher Education, 29(14), 16-21.

Bigge, M. L. (1976). Learning theories for teachers, 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row.

Black, L. C. (1982, March). Basic writing: Progressive proofreading. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Blount, N. S. (1973). Research on teaching literature, language and composition. In R. M. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. A project of The American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Company.

Blumenthal, J. C. (1972). English 3200: A programmed course in grammar and usage. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc.

Booth, W. C. (1981). The common aims that divide us; Or, is there a Profession 1981? Modern Language Association of America, Profession 81, pp. 13-17.

Bowles, D. J. (1981). An integrated approach to reading and writing for college students (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5039A. (University Microfilms No. 81 11502)

Brengle, R. T. (1983, January). Writing assessment at the University of Michigan. Notes from the National Testing Network in Writing (p. 6). A Project of the City University of New York and the Trend for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. New York: City University of New York, Instructional Resource Center.

Bruffee, K. A. (1980). Two related issues in peer tutoring: Program structure and tutor training. College Composition and Communication, 31(1), 76-80.

Bruner, J. (1960), The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buber, M. (1958). I and Thou, 2nd ed. (R. G. Smith, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. (Original work published in 1923)

Burke, K. (1969). A grammar of motives. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burnham, C. (1983, March). The Perry scheme and the literature teacher. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit, MI.

Burns, H. (1983, March). Computer literacy and the composition teacher. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit, MI.

Buxton, E. W. (1958). An experiment to test the effects of writing frequency and guided practice upon students' skills in written expression (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1958). Dissertation Abstracts International, 19, 709. (University Microfilms No. 58-03596)

Calhoun, J. (1971). The effect of analysis of essays in college composition classes on reading and writing skills (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1971A. (University Microfilms No. 71-26678)

Campbell, M. L. (1976). An investigation of the relationships between secondary generative and receptive communication skills at the college freshman level. University of Southern Mississippi. (Anne Arbor, MI: University Microfilms Order No. 77-05928) (Research in Education, April, 1978)

Campbell, P. (1981, August). Ready for college? Freshmen assess their preparation in English. (Research in Education, August, 1981) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 200 121)

Central State University and Foundations for Learning Press, Inc. (1983). Foundations for learning language. New York: Foundations for Learning Press, Inc.; Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.

Chickering, A. W. (1981, Spring). The modern American college: Integrating liberal education, work, and human development. Paper presented for Memphis State University's Professional Development Program, Spring, 1981.

Chickering, A., & Havighurst, R. J. (1981). The life cycle. In A. W. Chickering & Associates, The modern American college (pp. 16-50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ching, M. L. (1983). Thought and feeling: A reader for introductory composition students. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

City University of New York (CUNY) Task Force on Writing, Kenneth Bruffee, Brooklyn College, Chairman. (1979, April). CUNY Writing skills assessment test: Student essays evaluated and annotated by CUNY Task Force on Writing.

Collins, C. (1982, August). The use of writing to improve reading comprehension. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Boston, MA, November, 1981. (Research in Education, August, 1982) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 214 102)

Combs, W. E. (1975). Some further effects and implications of sentence-combining exercises for the secondary language arts curriculum (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 1266A. (University Microfilms No. 75-21042)

Communication. (1969). Encyclopoedia Britannica (Vol. 6, pp. 203-205). Chicago: Encyclopoedia Britannica, Inc.

Conlin, M. L. (1981). The relationship between the syntactical complexity of expository writing and reading comprehension levels of community college students (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 1126A. (University Microfilms Order No. 81-18796)

Cooper, C. (1984, March). Differences between reading and writing. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New York.

Cooper, C., & Odell, L. (Eds.) (1977). Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring,judging. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cooper, L. (1932). The rhetoric of Aristotle. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Corbett, E. P. J. (1984, March). How literature might be used fruitfully in the composition classroom. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New York.

Couture, B. A. Z. (1981). Reading to write: An exploration of the uses of analytic reading to teach composition (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4021A.

Davis, B., Scriven, M., & Thomas, S. (1981). The evaluation of composition instruction. Point Reyes, CA: Edgepress.

De Beaugrande, R. (1981). Psychology and composition: Past, present, future. In Martin Nystrand (Ed.), What writers know: Studies in the psychology of writing. New York: Academic.

De Blois, P. (1980, September). Inventional theory and writing in the content areas of freshman English. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Washington, DC, March, 1980. (Research in Education, September, 1980) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. 185 570)

Denison, J. H. (1982). Case studies showing similarities and differences among ten students of varying proficiency in English (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 5046A.

Eurich, A. C. (1980). The reading abilities of college students--after fifty years. New York: New York Times Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 742)

Euster, S. D. (1979). Utilization of the cloze procedure as a measure of writing skill of college students (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5900A. (University Microfilms No. 79-07601)

Fairbanks, M., & Elliott, M. (1981, May). Reading and writing: Relationships and functional reading component in a freshman composition course for underprepared students. 1979. (Research in Education, 1981)

Falke, A. (1982). What every educator should know about reading research. In T. Fulwiler & A. Young (Eds.), Language connections: Writing and reading across the curriculum. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Fisher, K. D. (1974). An investigation to determine if selected exercises in sentence-combining can improve reading and writing. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 4556A. (University Microfilms No. 74-02586)

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. College Composition and Communication, 30, 21-32.

Freeman, D. C. (1981). Phenomenal nominals. College Composition and Communication, 32, 183-188.

Fulwiler, T., & Young, A. (Eds.). (1982). Language connections: Writing and reading across the curriculum. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Glenn, R. J. (1946). The history of philosophy. St. Louis, MO: Herder Book Company.

Grassi, R., & De Blois, P. (1984). Composition and literature: A rhetoric for critical writing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Grobe, S., & Grobe, C. (1977). Reading skills as a correlate of writing ability in college freshmen. Reading World, 17(1), 50-54.

Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. College Composition and Communication, 33, 76-88.

Hairston, M. (1984). Working with advanced writers. College Composition and Communication, 35, 196-208.

Hake, R. & Williams, J. (1979). Sentence expanding: Not can, or how, but when. Sentence combining and the teaching of writing (pp. 134-146). Conway, AK: University of Central Arkansas.

Harvard Report. (1952). General education in school and college. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heller, M. F. (1980, December). The reading-writing connection: An analysis of the written language of university freshmen at two reading levels. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 342).

Hillocks, G., Kahn, E., & Johannessen, L. (1983). Teaching defining strategies as a mode of inquiry: Some effects on student writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 17, 275-284.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1977). The philosophy of composition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hodges, J. R., & Whitten, M. E. (1982). Harbrace college handbook, 9th ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovannovich, Inc.

Hoetker, J. (1972). Systems, systems approaches, and the teacher. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Howe, R. L. (1963). The miracle of dialogue. New York: The Seabury Press.

Humes, Ann. (1983). Research on the composing process. Review of Educational Research, 53(2), 201-216.

Hunt, K. W. (1977). Early blooming and late blooming syntactic structures. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging (91-104). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hunt, K. W., & O'Donnell, R. C. (1970). An elementary school curriculum to develop better writing skills. (Cooperative Research Project, No. 8-0903). Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 050 108)

Information theory. (1969). Encyclopoedia Britannica (Vol. 12, pp. 246B-249). Chicago: Encyclopoedia Britannica, Inc.

Irmscher, W. F. (1977). The teaching of writing in terms of growth. English Journal, 66, 33-36.

Jacobs, L. (1982). Faculty perceptions of the basic skills of university freshmen. (Indian Studies in Higher Education, No. 45). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Bureau of Evaluative Studies and Testing, Division of Research and Development. (Research in Education, February, 1982) (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 207 072)

James, W. (1958). The varieties of religious experience. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.

Johnson, T. W. (1984). Philosophy for children: An antidote to declining literacy. The Educational Forum: A Kappa Delta Pi Publication, 48(2), 235-241.

Keats, J. (1952). Lines on the Mermaid Tavern. In H. Spencer, W. Houghton, & H. Barrows (Eds.), British literature from Blake to the present day (Vol. 2, p. 327). Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. (Original work published in 1818)

Kerek, A., Daiker, D. A., & Morenberg, M. (1980). Sentence combining and college composition [Monograph Supplement]. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 51, 1059-1157 (Supplement 1-V51).

Kinneavy, J. L. (1971). A theory of discourse. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Kinneavy, J. L. (1982, March). Evaluating the effectiveness of college writing programs. Workshop before the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Dallas, TX.

Kitzhaber, A. R. (1963). Themes, theories, and therapy: The teaching of college writing. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In A. W. Chickering & Associates, The modern American college (pp. 232-255). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Krashen, S. (1977). The monitor model for adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Penocchiaro (Eds.), Viewpoints on English as a second language. New York: Regents.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Lapp, D., & Flood, J. (1978). Teaching reading to every child. New York: Macmillan.

Lederman, M. J., et al. (1984, May). Assessment and improvement of the academic skills of entering freshmen: A national survey. Research Monograph Series No. 5. (Research in Education, May, 1984)

Lederman, M. J., & Ribaudo, M. (1981). The basic skills effort at the City University of New York. (Research in Education, February, 1982) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 072)

Ledesma, L. G. (1981). Sentence-combining: Its role in comprehension at literal, reasoning, and evaluative levels and at three syntactic complexities (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3027A. (University Microfilms No. 80-29276)

Lunsford, A. (1983, March). The three r's: Reading, writing, and inferential reading. Paper presented at the meeting of the conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit, MI.

Lunsford, A. (1984, March). How studying our past can help us teach rhetoric in the present. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New York.

Lyons, G. (1984, March). Encouraging developmental errors. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New York.

Magee, M. (1979). A study of the relationship between syntactic fluency and silent reading comprehension in mature readers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 6598A. (University Microfilms No. 79-10992)

Maritain, J. (1956). Existence and the existent. (L. Galantiere & G. B. Phelan, Trans.). Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc. (Original work published in 1948 as Court traité de l'existence et de l'existant, Paris: Pantheon Books)

Matalene, C. B. (1982, March). Holistic scoring and objective test design. Workshop presented before the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco.

McColly, W. (1970). What does educational research say about the judging of writing ability? The Journal of Educational Research, 64(4), 1970.

McQueen, D. (1983, March). Imaging as a heuristic technique. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit, MI.

Memering, D., & O'Hare, F. (1984). Writer's work, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Meyer, B. J. F. (1982). Reading research and the composition teacher: The importance of plans. College Composition and Communication, 33, 37-49.

Miller, S. (1982). Classical practice and contemporary basics. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), The rhetorical tradition and modern writing (pp. 46-57). New York: The Modern Language Association, 1982.

Milton, J. (1959). Areopagetica. In G. B. Harrison (Ed.), Major British writers (enlarged ed., Vol. 1, pp. 428-451). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. (Original work published 1664)

Modern Language Association, Commission on the Future of the Profession. (1981). Commission on the Future of the Profession: Interim recommendations and responses. Profession 81, pp. 1-5.

Moran, C. (1981). Teaching writing/Teaching literature. College Composition and Communication, 32(1), 21-29.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 4, 1983, pp. 11-16.

National Council of Teachers of English, College Section, H. Jarrett, Chair. (1977). Guidelines for the workload of the College English teacher. College English, 39, 873-875.

Obenchain, A. C. (1971). Effectiveness of the precise essay question in programming the sequential development of written composition skills and the simultaneous development of critical reading skills. Master's thesis, George Washington University.

Odell, L. (1979, December). Redefining mature writing. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, Ottawa, Canada, May 8-11, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 781)

O'Hare, F. (1973). Sentence-combining: improving student writing without formal grammar instruction. (Research Report No. 15.) Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Ohmann, R. (1976). English in America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Osborn, M. (1976). Orientations to rhetorical style. Modules in Speech Communication [Monograph]. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Packard, V. (1957). The hidden persuaders. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.

Pearson, M. (1983, March). The transcendental meditation program and holistic development of writing ability. Paper presentd at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit, MI.

Perry, M. L. (1980). A study of the effect of a literary models approach to composition on reading and writing achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 6137A. (University Microfilms No. 80-13338)

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1981). Cognitive and ethical growth: The making of meaning. In A. W. Chickering & Associates, The modern American college (pp. 76-116). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pike, K. L. (1965). Language--Where science and poetry meet. College English, 26, 283-292.

Plato. (1956). Phaedrus (W. C. Helmbold & W. G. Rabinowitz, Trans.). Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. (Original work published in 416-415 B.C.)

Pope, A. (1959). Essay on criticism. In G. B. Harrison (Ed.), Major British writers (Vol. 1, rev. ed., pp. 760-768). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World. (Original work published in 1711)

Purnell, R. R. (1983, January). In survey of testing writing proficiency: A progress report. Notes from the National Testing Network in Writing (p. 18). A project in the City University of New York and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. New York: City University of New York, Resource Center.

Rankin, E. (1974). The cloze procedure revisited (pp. 254-258). In Twenty-third yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Clemson, SC.

Reps, P. (Compiler). (1957). Zen flesh, zen bones: A collection of zen and pre-zen writings. (N. Senzaki, transcriber). Garden City, NY: Anchor Books of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Rohman, D. G. (1965). Pre-Writing: The stage of discovery in the writing process. College Composition and Communication, 16, 106-112.

Science Research Associates. (1959). Science Research Associates Reading Laboratory--College Prep Edition, IVa. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Science Research Associates. (1959). Though it now seems.... Adapted from F. Russell, A journal of the plague, The Yale Review, Winter, 1958. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Scriven, M. (1973). The methodology of evaluation. In B. Worthen and J. Sanders (Eds.), Educational evaluation: Theory and practice (pp. 60-106). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Shuy, R. W. (1981). A holistic view of language. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 101-111.

Silver, A. B. (1970). English deprtment large-small class study: English 5-60, revised. Bakersfield, CA: Bakersfield Junior College. (Research in Education, December, 1970) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 041 586)

SIRS (Student-Instructional Rating System). (1980). R. Arreola, modification of Michigan State's Student-Instructional Rating System. Memphis State University, Memphis, TN: Center for Instructional Service and Research.

Squire, J. R. (1983, May). Composing and comprehending: Two sides of the same process. Language Arts, pp. 581-589.

Stedman, N. A., III (1971). The effect of a curriculum teaching syntactic embedding upon the reading comprehension of fourth-grade students (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 4850A. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-10049)

Sternglass, M. (1976). Composition teacher as reading teacher. College Composition and Communication, 27, 378-382.

Sternglass, M. (1983). In Reading, Writing and Reasoning. New York: Macmillan.

Stewart, M. F. (1978). Syntactic maturity from high school to university: A first look. Research in the Teaching of English, 12(1) 37-46.

Stotsky, S. L. (1975). Sentence-combining as a curricular activity: Its effect on written language development and reading comprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 9(1), 30-71.

Straw, S. B. (1978). An investigation of the effect of sentence-combining and sentence-reduction instruction on measures of syntactic fluency, reading comprehension, and listening comprehension in fourth-grade students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 720A. (University Microfilms No. 79-18398)

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1973). An introduction to the PDK book: Educational evaluation and decision-making. From an address delivered at the Eleventh Annual PDK Symposium on Educational Research, The Ohio State University, June 24, 1970. In B. Worthen & J. Sanders (Eds.), Educational evaluation: Theory and practice (pp. 128-150). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Tang, M. (1979). A study of the relationship between the reading and writing abilities of underprepared college students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Kansas City, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3215A. (University Microfilms Order No. 79-26597)

Thomas, W., & Brown, S. G. (1941). Reading poems: An introduction to critical study. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trimmer, J., & Hairston, M. (1981). The Riverside Reader. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Troyka, L. Q. (1973). A study of the effect of simulation games on the expository prose competence of college remedial English students (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 4092A. (University Microfilms No. 73-30136)

Twain, M. (1981). Two views of the river. From Life on the Mississippi. In J. Trimmer & M. Hairston (Eds.), The riverside reader (pp. 184-186). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. (Original work published in 1883)

Vander Zanden, J.W. (1981). Human development (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). Thought and langauge (E. Haufmann & G. Vakar, ed. & trans.) Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Weathersby, R. P. (1981). Ego development. In A. W. Chickering & Associates, The modern American college (pp. 51-75). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Weiss, R. H., & Walters, S. A. (1981). Writing to learn. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA: April, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 056)

White, E. M. (1983, March). Excerpts from Research in effective teaching of writing, Phase I--Final Report, draft. Workshop before the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Detroit, MI.

Williams, J. M. (1985, April). An evaluation and some recommendations. (Available from Department of English, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN.)

Winterowd, W. R. (1981, March). What can writers learn, and how? Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Dallas, TX.

Witte, S. P., Daly, J. A., Faigley, L., & Koch, W. R. (1983). The empirical development of an instrument for reporting course and teacher effectiveness in college writing classes. (FIPSE Grant G008005896) (Technical Report No. 3). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 981)

Witte, S. P., & Faigley, L. (1983). Evaluating college writing programs. Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DIALOGICAL MICROCOSMIC SENTENCES

1. Exposition of a thought by means of narrating an event:

   By doing I, doing II, and doing III, I discovered that (subject predicate).

2. Exposition of a thought by means of describing in detail a person, place, or thing:

   The farm, with its first detail, second detail, and third detail, showed that a boy could have heaven on earth.

3. Exposition of a thought by means of exemplifying or illustrating:

   The law of gravity, which is illustrated by perfume's spreading in a room, water's filling a lake-bed when a dam opens, and lettuce's soaking up water, reveals that nature inexorably exercises power over man.

4. Exposition of a thought by means of defining along with exemplifying:

   The law of gravity, which is defined as the propensity of liquids and gases to spread evenly over space allotted and is illustrated by perfume's spreading in a room, water's filling a lake-bed when a dam opens, and lettuce's soaking up water, reveals that nature inexorably exercises power over man.

5. Exposition of a thought by means of contrasting or comparing:

   Since House A has its detail, detail, and detail, and House B has its detail, detail, and detail, only one house is really home-like.

   Of the two guns, the muzzleloader, with its difficulties caused by its heaviness, its unpredictable ignition system, and its single action, and the chanbered firearm, with its practicality caused by its variety of models, its self-primed cartridges, and multiple actions, the chambered firearm will get the hunter more game.

6. Exposition of a thought by means of classifying:

   Through observing three kinds of book-owners, _____, _____, and _____, a person can discover that only the third kind really owns books.

7. Exposition of a thought by analyzing for cause or effect:

   Terrorism causes Effect I, Effect II, and Effect III, all of which amount to an overall effect.

   Terrorism is caused by Cause I, Cause II, and Cause III, all of which show an underlying cause.

8. Exposition of a thought by analyzing a process into steps:

   Water skiing is thrilling if a beginning skier mounts suspensefully, rises cautiously, and rides gloriously.

   By doing I which leads to doing II which leads to doing III, a person can find that _____.

9. Persuasive argument to arouse listeners to action:

   Good people, since Problem-Effect X exists, partially because Cause Y, which never should happen, does occur, Cause Y can be overcome by carrying out Solution Z through the appropriate process.

APPENDIX B

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND WRITINGS FOR ENGLISH 1101-____, Fall 198_

Purposes: Dialogue occurs when the whole truth and being of one person confronts the whole truth and being of another. Dialogue-in-written discourse occurs when a person who has discovered something meaningful to communicate considers which readers need to know and then chooses caringly written means to convey his thoughts to them. More specifically in this class, after we discover our own new thoughts and consider readers who are colleagues or are teachers, we shall use such means as contrasting and classifying to explain our discoveries to readers, usually in 500-word essays. During the semester, we shall read dialogues and write dialogues, asking three questions:

Who wants to express what insight, and why? (Is there a central point?)
To whom is what insight expressed, and why? (Is there experienceable development?)
By what means is the insight conveyed effectively? (Is there suitable coherence?)

These questions help us read and write at each of the seven recursive steps in reading and writing. We will prepare for reading and writing at the college level now and will lay foundations for reading and writing after English 1101 is completed.

Materials and Weekly Activities: During a typical week, we shall read in The Riverside Reader essays developed by a particular means of explanation, such as classifying, asking the three questions. To help in writing paragraphs and essays, we turn chiefly to Writer's Work, 2nd ed. Also, we shall review writing accurately worded, clearly structured sentences in Harbrace College Handbook, 9th ed, 1984 printing. Usually compositions are planned outside of class, written during class, returned to you in the next class meeting, revised by you to turn in at the following class meeting, and frequently rewritten for the following class meeting as well. To help him or her during the years of college, everyone needs a college dictionary, selected from HCH, p. 210. To revise papers, buy a green pen. To hold revised, rewritten papers, buy a tabbed 8" x 11" manila folder; label it on the tab with your last name, first name, English 1101-____, Mrs. Battle, Fall, 198_; turn it in before class next meeting. For holding reading-and-writing journal pages, secure a folder which has pockets on both inner sides.

Sep. 11 Introduction: purposes, materials; process and aids; evaluation. Reading sample.
13 Overview of reading and writing. WW, pp. 3-27. Paragraph 1. Discuss seven steps. Assignment and handout concerning next paper.

18 EXPOSITION (EXPLANATION) BY NARRATING. Riverside Reader, pp. 1-33; 53-63. Handout on seven steps of reading. Writer's Work, 29-65; personal writing. Paragraph unity: HCH, rule 31a; WW, 258-261. Review sentence unity in HCH, rules 1, 2, 3, 12a, 13a-b, 14a, 17, 23a, 29.
20 Write exposition by narration assigned on the 18th.

25 EXPOSITION BY DESCRIBING. RR, selections, 83-128. WW: effective paragraphs, 295-313; thesis and support, WW, 240-59, 65-74; HCH, rule 31b. Review sentence development: HCH, 12b-d, 13c-e, 14b-a, 16, 17d-i, 23b.
27 Write exposition by description as planned on the 25th.

Oct. 2 EXPOSITION BY DEFINITION (Paragraph 4). RR, selections from pp. 281-318. WW, 120-126. Coherence in paragraphs WW, 243-250; HCH, 31c-d. Review coherence in sentences: HCH, 4-7, 23c, 26-28.
4 Write exposition by definition, examples added.

---

9 EXPOSITION BY COMPARISON AND CONTRAST, using any previously learned patterns.
11 RR, selections from 179-228. WW, 67-90; introductions and conclusions,
16 WW, 261-269; HCH. Turn in objective summary on selection read; WW, 130-132.
18 Review words: unity or correct root, HCH, 9-11, 20a; parts of words: HCH, 18, 20b-c, 21-22; suitability: HCH, 19. Sentence outlines on handouts and in HCH, 468-471; outlines on the board; outline conferences by appointment. Writing in class from outline. Revise and rewrite composition.

Tentative Schedule of Readings and Writings
For English 1101-____, Fall 198_ (Continued)

Oct. 23 EXPOSITION BY CLASSIFICATION. RR, 229-233, and selections from 234-280. WW, 96-105.
25 Sentence-debining and sentence-combining, WW, selections from 275-309.
31 Turn in critical summary of a reading: WW, 132-136. Form chunks within
Nov. 1 paragraphs in WW, 274-294. Outlines on the board. Outline conferences. Write, revise, and rewrite exposition by classification.

6 EXPOSITION BY CAUSAL ANALYSIS AND/OR PROCESS ANALYSIS. RR, selections 129-178;
8 319-353. WW, 109-119. Turn in comparison of articles read, WW, 136-140.
13 Effective sentences in WW, 314-334; HCH, 29. Review sentence-debining and
15 sentence-combining. Write expository analysis.

---

20 ARGUMENT, using effect, cause, and solution. RR, selections 365-420.
27 WW, 151-176. Turn in critical review of an essay read; WW, 140-150.
29 Outlines on board; conferences; peer planning. Write argument, revise, and
Dec. 4 rewrite. Possibly argument will be rewritten in class.

6 Paragraph 5 in class. Discuss readings for final.

11 Final reading sample. Review for final. Bring folders up to date.

18 Final essay on readings 10:30-12:30.

Evaluation of the essays will be made on the basis of whether they would, with only a minor change, be acceptable in other college classes freshmen take during the second semester. Explanations or handouts will be provided.

Evaluation in the course depends on whether all compositions, revisions and required rewritten papers are turned in on time. 1/8 on best of five paragraphs averaged with best of initial and final reading assessments; 1/8 on comparison and contrast; 1/8 classification; 1/8 causal or process analysis; 2/8 argument; and 2/8 final paper on readings.

Revising a paper means writing the rule near the rule number and making each correction nearby. Rewriting means making substantial improvements, such as reorganizing the paper or adding examples.

Absences must be diligently avoided. Nothing excuses not completing all work; late work will be reduced in grade. Please telephone me in advance to explain every absence; also write a note of explanation to give me just before or after the next class meeting. Each person is responsible for calling classmates to get announcements, notes, and assignments if he or she is ever necessarily absent; homework must be completed on time; papers and handouts should be picked up from the envelope on my door; make an appointment to write in my office any paper that the rest of the class wrote in the classroom. Anyone who is tardy should provide a note of explanation before leaving class. Everyone will find the course easy if he attends and works regularly. Never stop!

Instructor: Mary Vroman Battle (Mrs. Allen Overton Battle). The English Department's telephone is 454-2651. My office number is 454-2648. My home telephone is _____.

Office and office hours: Patterson # . MW: 9-10, 12:10-12:40; TTh: 9-9:25, 10:50-11:30, 12-12:40. F: 9-10, 12:05-? Also by appointment and telephone.

Name_____Telephone Number_____

Name_____Telephone Number_____

Name_____Telephone Number_____

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THIS SEMESTER'S ACTIVITIES
TO LEARN READING LITERATURE AND WRITING COMPOSITIONS

Name_____
Date of Birth_____
Average Hours Worked for Pay
Each Week _____
Absences _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Information from you will make it possible to recognize the activities of this semester that were helpful in your learning to read literature and write compositions better. Since future students can benefit from your comments, please respond seriously to all of the following. Encircle the number of the phrase that best expresses the value of each of the activities listed below.

1. Very helpful
2. Helpful
3. Sometimes helpful, sometimes not; undecided
4. Not helpful
5. A hindrance

1 2 3 4 5 A. Review of the idea of dialogue and the three basic questions (what is the writer's thought? what are the reader's needs? by what steps can writer reach reader?)

1 2 3 4 5 B. Pre-reading, including asking the author an opening question and forming a microcosmic sentence.

1 2 3 4 5 C. Forming the microcosmic sentence for one's own papers, sometimes using the patterns given in class.

1 2 3 4 5 D. Noticing how authors lead readers from question to question, for instance from questions about a problem to the cause and to the solution. (Recall sentence outlines placed on the blackboard.)

1 2 3 4 5 E. Forming "steps" in a sentence outline for one's own composition, sometimes during office conferences.

1 2 3 4 5 F. Breaking down long complex sentences into short, understandable sentences.

1 2 3 4 5 G. Combining short sentences so as to emphasize the main point and subordinate lesser facts. (Recall 24b in HCH.)

1 2 3 4 5 H. Reading aloud essays from RR or exercises in HCH to hear what is there.

1 2 3 4 5 I. Peer-editing or self-editing compositions to read what is there.

1 2 3 4 5 J. Evaluating essays and compositions Platonically (truth, concern for readers, pleasingness) and Aristotle-ly (unified thought, well-developed, orderliness).

1 2 3 4 5 K. Using all of the instructor's reactions to rewrite papers.

1 2 3 4 5 L. Discussing essays from RR, such as "The Knife" and Mark Twain's essay on the Mississippi River, in class.

1 2 3 4 5 M. Listening to other students' compositions read aloud in class and talking about their strengths.

1 2 3 4 5 N. Keeping a journal of non-assigned readings.

1 2 3 4 5 O. Keeping a journal of free writing.

****

To what extent did reading in RR and WW help you in writing various types of compositions for this class and other classes? Explain.

To what extent did writing different types of compositions help your reading for this class and other classes? Explain.

APPENDIX D

CLOZE READING SAMPLES: INSTRUCTIONS AND THREE SELECTIONS

Instructions

Example of Reading Skills

Instructions: In order to give an estimate of your skills in reading, please thoughtfully fill in the blank spaces in the following short composition. As much as possible, try to use the exact words of the author. Although you may have difficulty choosing certain words, you will find it easy to chose some of the words. Only one word goes into each blank. Under the circumstances, do your best to complete all blanks within forty minutes.

Student Number_____

Selections

Pre-Sample in Pilot Study and Demonstration:
"Jobs in Science"

As the horizons of science have expanded, two main groups of scientists have emerged. One is the pure scientist; the other, the applied scientist.

The pure or theoretical scientist does original research in order to understand the basic laws of nature that govern our world. The applied scientist adapts this knowledge to practical problems. Neither is more important than the other, however for the two groups are very much related.

Sometimes, however, the applied scientist finds the "problems" for the theoretical scientist to work on. Let's take a particular problem of the aircraft industry: heat-resistant metals. Many of the metals and alloys which perform satisfactorily in a car cannot be used in a jet-propelled plane. New alloys must be used, because the jet engine

operates a much higher temperature than an automobile engine. The turbine wheel in a turbojet must withstand temperatures as high as 1,600 degrees Fahrenheit, so aircraft designers had to turn to the research metallurgist for the development of metals and alloys that would do the job in jet-propelled planes.

Dividing scientists into two groups--pure and applied--is only one broad way of classifying them, however. When scientific knowledge was very limited, there was no need for men to specialize. Today, with the great body of scientific knowledge, scientists specialize in many different fields. Within each field, there is even further subdivision. And, with finer and finer subdivisions, the various sciences have become more and more interrelated until no one branch is entirely independent of the others. Many new specialties--geophysics and biochemistry, for example--have resulted from combining the knowledge of two or more sciences.

Reprinted by permission from SRA READING LABORATORY® IVa by Don H. Parker. © 1959, Science Research Associates, Inc.; as adapted from "Jobs in Science," JOB FAMILY SERIES #1. Copyright 1958 by Science Research Associates, Inc.

Post-Sample in Demonstration: From
The Hidden Persuaders

One motivational analyst who became curious to know why there had been such a great rise in impulse buying at supermarkets was James Vicary. He suspected that some special psychology must be going on inside the women as they shopped in supermarkets. His suspicion was that perhaps they underwent such an increase in tension when confronted with so many possibilities that they were forced into making quick purchases. He set out to find out if this were true. The best way to detect what was going on inside the shopper was through the use of a galvanometer or lie detector. That obviously was impractical. The next best thing was to use a hidden motion-picture camera and record the eye-blink rate of the women as they shopped. How fast a person blinks his eyes is a pretty good index of his state of inner tension. The average person, according to Mr. Vicary, normally blinks his eyes about 32 times a minute. If he is tense, he blinks them more frequently; and, under extreme tension, he may blink up to 50 or 60 times a minute. If he is notably relaxed, on the other hand, his eye-blink rate may drop to a subnormal twenty or less.

Mr. Vicary set up his cameras and started following the ladies as they entered the store. The results were startling, even to him. Their eye-blink rate; instead of going up to indicate mounting tension, went down and down, to a very subnormal fourteen blinks a minutes. the ladies fell into what Mr. Vicary calls a hypnoidal trance, a light kind of trance that, he explains, is the first stage of hypnosis. Mr. Vicary has decided that the main cause of the trance is that the supermarket is packed with products which in former years would have been items only kings and queens could have afforded and here in this fairyland they were available to all. Mr. Vicary

theorizes: "Just within this generation, anyone can be a king or queen and go through these stores where the products say 'buy me, buy me.'"

Packard Vance (1957). The hidden persuaders. New York: David McKay Co., Inc. (pp. 106-107).

Post-Sample in Pilot Study: From Language for Everybody

Culture is the sum total of all the traditions, customs, beliefs, and ways of life of a given group of human beings. In this sense, every group has a culture, however savage, undeveloped, or uncivilized it may seem to us.

To the professional anthropologist, there is no intrinsic superiority of one culture over another, just as to the professional linguist there is no intrinsic hierarchy among languages.

People once thought of the languages of backward groups as savage, undeveloped forms of speech, consisting largely of grunts and groans. While it is possible that language in general began as a series of grunts and groans, it is a fact established by the study of "backward" languages that no spoken tongue answers that description today. Most languages of uncivilized groups are, by our most severe standards, extremely complex, delicate, and ingenious pieces of machinery for the transfer of ideas. They fall behind our Western languages not in their sound patterns or grammatical structures, which usually are fully adequate for all language needs, but only in their vocabularies, which reflect the objects and activities known to their speakers. Even in this department, however, two things are to be noted: 1. All languages seem to possess the machinery for vocabulary expansion, either by putting together words already in existence or by borrowing them from other languages and adapting them to their own system. 2. The objects and activities requiring names and distinctions in "backward" languages, while different from ours, are often surprisingly numerous and complicated. A Western language distinguishes merely between two degrees of remoteness ("this" and "that"); some languages of the American Indians distinguish between what is close to the speaker, or to the person addressed, or removed from both, or out of sight, or in the past, or in the future.

This study of language, in turn, casts a new light upon the claim of the anthropologists that all cultures are to be viewed independently, and without ideas of rank or hierarchy.

Reprinted by permission from SRA READING LABORATORY® IIb by Don H. Parker. © 1959, Science Research Associates, Inc.; as adapted from LANGUAGE FOR EVERYBODY by Mario Pei, pp. 107-108, 211-212, copyright 1936 by the Devin-Adair Company. Permission granted by the Devin-Adair Publishers.

SCORE SHEET TO BE USED BY RATING COMMITTEE*

Rater identification ___ _____
Paper identification _____
Set identification _____

I First Reading-Basic Soundness or Unity

A. Mark each error with an abbreviation in the margin of each paper. (Later, tally and total.)

sp = spelling _____
pu = punctuation _____ _____
us = usage _____ _____
gr = grammar _____ _____
se = sentence _____ _____
fo = form _____ _____

B. Give points directly on the score sheet for the following:

1. Variety in sentence structure (2 points apiece) 20 _____
2. General fluency of sentences 10 _____
3. Introduction (compare with ranked samples) 10 _____
4. Conclusion (compare with ranked samples) 10 _____
5. Overall Significance 30 _____

II. Second Reading-Effective Development

Making no marks on the paper, on the front or back of this sheet, jot down a key word to identify each example of the following, give it a score, and place the total in the left margin.

A. Evidence of critical thinking (defining terms, recognizing generalizations, providing evidence, etc.) (First evidence = 3-5 each; 2-3 for added evidence; 2-3 for recognizing difference between fact and opinion...) 30 _____

B. Originality (use of humour, exaggeration for effect, mock seriousness, anticlimax, understatement, pretentious language used for effect, ...) 30 _____

C. Diction

1. Exactness and vividness of nouns, verbs, adjectives,.... (Give 1-2 each.) 20 _____

2. Interesting and appropriate figures of speech, comparisons, illustrations, allusions, rhetorical questions.... (Give 1-2 each.) 20 _____

III. Third Reading-Coherence

Making no marks on the paper, except for transitions, give only a score. For transitions, on the front or the back of this sheet, jot down a key word to identify each, give it a score or 2-3 depending on the number of transitional devices and the number of paragraphs in the paper.

A. Title (interest and appropriateness) 5 _____
B. Logical sequence of paragraphs 10 _____
C. Unity within paragraphs 10 _____
D. Transitions between paragraphs 10 _____
E. General coherence 10 _____

IV. Raw score = A_____ + B_____/2 + 75 - E ____ = ____

E = (number of errors/number of words) x 1000

*Revised version of Hunter's (1958) scoring sheet.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F

WRITING SAMPLES

Instructions: It is important to have a sample of your best writing. During fifty minutes of the next class period, you will have an opportunity to write a short composition. The composition may be written as one paragraph or a series of paragraphs, the total words being over 200. Please write on every other line so that you can readily make any desired additions, deletions, or corrections. For your use, a dictionary and handbook will be available at the instructor's desk. Since you may want to think about the topic before writing, you may make notes at the bottom of this sheet.

To the next class meeting, bring this sheet, a pen, and notebook paper. Here is the topic:

WHAT KIND OF POSITIONS ARE COLLEGE GRADUATES LIKELY TO HOLD IN CONTRAST WITH THE KIND OF POSITIONS HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ARE LIKELY TO FIND? EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER BY CONTRASTING THE TWO KINDS OF POSITIONS IN SEVERAL WAYS. (Brief definitions may be helpful. Imagine that your readers are intelligent high school seniors.)

****

Second Topic

WHAT IS A MAJOR MARK OF MATURITY IN A PERSON? IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN THIS MARK OR QUALITY, CONTRAST A MATURE PERSON WITH AN IMMATURE PERSON ON SEVERAL CRITERIA. (At least one brief definition is likely to be helpful to your readers. Imagine that your readers are intelligent high school seniors.)

****